FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 058 *23 March 1984*

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISARMAMENT/START/MBFR

U.S. Deployment Plan for ABM Systems Excoriated AA 1
[Editorial Article in PRAVDA 23 Mar]
Semeyko Hits U.S. Quest for 'Superiority' AA 3
[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 16 Mar]
USSR Deploys New Missiles in Czechoslovakia [AFP] AA 6
Zamyatin Cited on Missiles, Arms Talks AA 6
Chervov on U.S. Arms Treaty 'Violations' AA 8
[Madrid EL PAIS 15 Mar]
Proceedings of Disarmament Conference Noted AA 9
[Korzhev]
CSSR Delegate Speaks at Vienna MBFR Talks AA 11
Norms for Nuclear Powers' Relations Stressed AA 11
[Vasilyev in PRAVDA 22 Mar]
CPSU Department Official Cited on Nuclear Issues AA 15
[Helsinki HUFVUDSTADSBLADET 22 Mar]

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

CEMA Trade Commission Meets in Moscow 20-22 Mar BB 1
Editorial on Warsaw Pact Countries' Cooperation BB 1
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 22 Mar]
Socialist States Participate in Nuclear Meeting BB 3

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

'Fabrications' on USSR Supplied Chemical Weapons CC 1
[Musayelyan in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 18 Mar]
NATO Exercises in Norway Linked to Soviet Threat CC 2
[Kuzar in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 21 Mar]
Soviet Peace Committee Makes Appeal to CDE Session CC 4
Soviet Peace Committee Statement on Nuclear War CC 5

UNITED STATES & CANADA

News Conference on Reagan's PRC Visit A 1
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 23 Mar]
Campaign Issues, Democratic Candidates Eyed A 1
[Bovin in IZVESTIYA 21 Mar]
U.S. 'Unworthy Policy' on Dialogue Efforts A 3
[Mnatsakanov]
U.S. Nuclear War Plan Tied to Foreign Policy A 4
[Zholkver]
U.S. Submarine 'Espionage' Activities Publicized A 5
[Kharkov]

Economic 'Burden' of U.S. Arms Spending Cited A 6
[Koryavin in IZVESTIYA 6 Mar]
Admiral Compares Strength of U.S., USSR Navies A 7
[Amelko in MOSCOW NEWS 18 Mar]
U.S. Leaflet on Soviet Propaganda Challenged A 11
[Burlatskiy in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 14 Mar]

CHINA

PRC Premier Says 'Warm Welcome' Awaits Reagan B 1
Comparison of PRC Border Navigation Meeting B 1
Briefs: World Meteorologists in Beijing B 1

NORTHEAST ASIA

Nakasone Arrives in PRC for 'Official Visit' C 1
Japanese Deputy Foreign Minister Visits Kiev C 1
[PRAVDA UKRAINY 18 Mar]
U.S. SOF's Okinawa Deployment 'Danger' to Asia C 1
[Dmitriyev]
'Unprecedented Scale' of 'Team Spirit-84' Hit C 3
[Solovyev]
USSR, MPR Amity Groups Sign Cooperation Protocol C 3
[PRAVDA 20 Mar]
More Reportage on USSR-DPRK Treaty Anniversary C 4
Soviet Official Hails Event C 4
Soviets 'Proud' of DPRK [Mikhaylov] C 5
Pact 'Important Milestone' C 7

SOUTH ASIA

U.S. Involvement in Afghanistan Lambasted D 1
Reagan Remarks Protested D 1
Mosque Bombing U.S. 'Crime' D 1
Aid to 'Bandits' Mounting D 2
USSR Impact on DRA Production, Trade Increases D 2
Comparison of Babrak Karmal's New Year Message D 3

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

'Hopeful' Results Produced by Thach Tour E 1
Indonesian Foreign Minister Set To Visit USSR E 2
Guam 'Major U.S. Base' in Western Pacific E 2

EASTERN EUROPE

Hoffmann Visits Kubinka, Riga; Aides Honored F 1
Visits Kubinka Air Base F 1
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 22 Mar]
Meetings in Riga F 1
[Karpov in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 23 Mar]
GDR Military Aides' Awards F 2
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 22 Mar]
USSR To Speed Goods Deliveries to Poland F 2
[Warsaw]
Rusakov Receives CSSR's Stefanjak in Moscow F 3
[PRAVDA 21 Mar]
Briefs: Hungarian Microelectronics Protocol F 3

WESTERN EUROPE

Reagan Remarks on France; Mitterrand Visit G 1
[Zhukov in PRAVDA 21 Mar]
Anti-Sovietism Seen in Norwegian Premier's Remarks G 2
[Ivanov in IZVESTIYA 21 Mar]
Swedish Official on 'Stable' Relations With USSR G 3
[IZVESTIYA 18 Mar]
Stukhalin Meets Austrian CP Chief in Vienna G 3
[PRAVDA 21 Mar]

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Husayn Remarks 'Real Shock' to Washington H 1
[Demchenko in PRAVDA 21 Mar]
U.S. Cancels Stinger To Teach Jordan 'Lesson' H 2
Arabs Demands USSR Join in M.E. Settlement Process H 2
[Arutyunov]
Results of Lausanne Conference Outlined H 3
[Geyvandov and Kuznetsov in IZVESTIYA 22 Mar]
U.S., Israel To Construct Satellite Spy Station H 4
Syrian CP Leader Bakdash on Lebanon, CP Policy H 4
[Myakota]
Al-Asad Meets With Newly Formed Government H 5
Sudan Raid Pretext for U.S. To Attack Libya H 6
[Korionov in PRAVDA 22 Mar]
U.S. Campaign Against Libya H 7
[Zlatorinskiy]
Libyans Protest [Mnatsakanov] H 8
Areas of Economic Cooperation With Libya Listed H 8
[Komarov]
Algerian Information Minister Concludes Visit H 9
Meeting Hails USSR-YAR Ties on Anniversary H 9
[IZVESTIYA 21 Mar]
Greetings to YAR President H 9
[IZVESTIYA 21 Mar]

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

U.S., RSA 'Benefaction' Will Not Help UNITA J 1
[Demidov in PRAVDA]
Eritrea's Economic Progress, Separatist Problem J 1
[Serbin in PRAVDA 19 Mar]

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

Materials Concerning Lugansk Tanker Incident K 1
U.S. Reaction to Protest [Pravdin] K 1
U.S. 'Totally Distorting' Facts K 2
[Kornilov]
Levchenko Commentary K 3
U.S. 'Muscle-Flexing Show' in C. America Decried K 4
[Kolesnikov]
Communique on Cuban-Angolan Summit in Havana K 5
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 21 Mar]
Communique Applauded [Tanov] K 7
Reagan Remarks to Cuban 'Rabble' Ridiculed K 8
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 22 Mar]
'Effort To Win Votes' K 8

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Moscow TV Reports Regular Politburo Meeting R 1
Literary Critics, Journals Scored for Poor Work R 2
[Sidorov in PRAVDA 19 Feb]
TASS Reports Gazli Earthquake Relief Measures R 6
Book Published on Work With People's Letters R 7
[PRAVDA 18 Mar]
Leningrad Unveils Plaque Honoring Kosygin R 7
Briefs: Tashkent Komsomol Signs Agreements; R 7
Arkhangelsk Oblast Television

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Improvement in Economic Research Stressed S 1
[Editorial in PRAVDA 21 Mar]
Briefs: Kazakh Coal Mining; Uzbek Workers S 2

AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS

Tajik Agriculture Problems, Tasks Examined T 1
Protection of Inland Fish Stocks Discussed T 3
[PRAVDA 17 Mar]

MILITARY DEVELOPMENTS

Improvement in Military Administration Urged V 1
[Korniyenko in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 20 Mar]

U.S. DEPLOYMENT PLAN FOR ABM SYSTEMS EXCORIATED

PM221653 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Mar 84 First Edition p 5

[Editorial article: "Large-Scale Provocation Against Peace"]

[Text] The White House's present rhetoric on questions of foreign policy, including military policy, is characterized by rare duplicity.

For instance, a plan is adopted for the deployment of 100 of the new more powerful and more accurate MX missiles carrying a total of 1,000 nuclear warheads, and as though in mockery of common sense, this missile, which is adapted to deliver a first disarming strike, is immediately given the name of "peacekeeper."

They begin deploying long-range nuclear cruise missiles on a massive scale with a view to creating for the Soviet Union, as American figures themselves admit, a "source of constant danger from practically all directions without exception," and they immediately claim that they are doing this for the sake of stabilizing the world situation.

But probably no issue is now the subject of as much hypocritical pseudopeace-loving talk as the plans for the deployment of a large-scale ABM system.

There is talk of the lofty "morality" of the further round of the strategic arms race that is being launched and of the need to shelter the "defenseless" U.S. population from ballistic missiles. It is even claimed that this is virtually the best way to eliminate nuclear war in general.

However, what is really at issue?

The essence of the question is that a large-scale ABM system, that is, a system that would ensure the protection of the entire territory of a country, and still more so of several states, including both military and civilian targets, can have only one objective--to create a shield under cover of which it would be possible to contemplate delivering a devastating nuclear strike against the otherside without fear of retribution or else in the expectation of substantially neutralizing retribution.

Thus the inexorable logic of nuclear confrontation in the modern era is such that plans aimed at creating a ramified system of ABM defenses pursue by no means defensive objectives but are an inseparable element of the course toward acquiring a first-strike potential and attaining military superiority.

It was therefore not a coincidental but a profoundly logical fact that in concluding the treaty on the limitation of ABM systems in 1972 the USSR and the United States reached accord on banning the development of systems for the antimissile defense of the territory of each of the two countries and also the creation of the bases for such defense.

This decision was also of tremendous fundamental significance from the viewpoint of curbing the nuclear arms race in all fields and consequently averting the undermining of strategic stability and the intensification of the war danger.

It is precisely this fundamental provision of the ABM treaty that U.S. Administration figures are currently undermining. It manifestly hampers their claims to military leadership and shackles their militarist ambitions. An overt and unconcealed course has been adopted -- that of exploding strategic stability and destroying the foundation and with it the whole of the 1972 treaty.

However, the 1972 treaty was not only signed but also ratified in accordance with all the rules of American constitutional procedure and is furthermore termless. How can this be gotten round? How can it be justified to people?

Demagoguery is being brought into play alleging some "nobility of the objectives" which the supporters of the development by the United States of a large-scale ABM system are purportedly setting themselves, asserting the "peace-loving" thrust of this project, and virtually alleging that the United States is going to develop a large-scale ABM system in order to... "share it" with the Soviet Union.

However, those people in the United States who are boastfully and self-confidently demanding the adoption of expeditious measures to implement the large-scale ABM program proclaimed by President R. Reagan in March last year are not taking account of the main thing -- the Soviet Union's inevitable reaction to the implementation of these plans. And if some people hope that some kind of "advantages" in the technological field will enable the United States to leap ahead, they risk making a severe miscalculation.

It is time that Washington figures also gave thought to the fact that the very intention to smash the existing equilibrium of strategic forces with the help of the deployment in space and on earth of ramified ABM defenses is a challenging provocation to the Soviet Union and toward peace calculated for decades to come.

Surely the dangerous consequences for the interests of all mankind entailed by the new round in the arms race, which is being organized by the United States, are obvious?

After all, the Soviet Union will not sit idly by, indifferently watching all these militaristic ventures. The United States will not acquire military superiority over the socialist countries even if it goes out into space with its new armaments. However, the danger of a catastrophe will become even more exacerbated and the foundations of the process of limiting the arms race will be seriously undermined.

The idea of "star wars" in the realms of space did not, of course, dawn upon the White House by chance. After hundreds and hundreds of billions had been earmarked for the arms race in all imaginable "traditional" channels -- in the sphere of strategic and "European" nuclear arms, and in the sphere of conventional and chemical weapons -- yet another "vein of gold" was discovered in Washington and this is hurriedly being offered to Californian, Texan, and other military industrial business magnates so that they can derive super profits from it. There is a desire to gratify them with military orders on the kind of scale and of such long duration that were previously undreamed of, and at the same time to preprogram the U.S. course toward unbridled militarization for many decades to come.

The present U.S. policymakers are not abashed here either by the conclusions of eminent scientific authorities in this sphere who say that in no way will the United States succeed in escaping a retaliatory strike, or by the danger which, by their actions they are incurring for the peoples, including their own people, nor again by the ever accelerating squandering of enormous material resources which are so necessary for solving acute problems both in individual countries and also on the scale of mankind as a whole, such as the struggle against hunger and disease, environmental protection, and so forth.

By continuing to take the path of preparations for nuclear war on land, at sea, in the air, and now in space too, Washington is inevitably counterposing itself to the fundamental interests of all people and is truly becoming that "focus of evil" in the quest for whose whereabouts it is so vigorously engaged.

For many years now, and particularly with the R. Reagan administration's advent to power, the American side has been endeavoring to convince people that the best method of extinguishing a fire is to pour oil on the flames, and the best method of strengthening security is to pile up ever newer mountains of weapons.

And what is the result? This policy is disrupting international relations, creating crises in the economic seven of the developed capitalist states, bringing entire continents to the brink of bankruptcy, and confronting the United States itself with insoluble domestic problems. And the main thing: such a policy pushes mankind ever closer to nuclear catastrophe.

To halt the arms race and begin arms reductions, not to break the agreements that have been concluded -- as Washington is doing -- but to strengthen and strictly observe them, and consistently to broaden the fabric of treaty limitations on armaments -- people throughout the world are now demanding such a turnabout in the development of international affairs.

The Treaty on the Limitation of ABM Systems is in force, and it must be fulfilled irrespective of the whims or sentiments of one Washington figure or another.

The Soviet Union advocates not only not opening up new avenues of the arms race, in the ABM sphere included -- which means in the sphere of strategic offensive armaments also -- but resolutely closing all possible channels for rivalry along these avenues.

In proposing specific standards for mutual relations among the powers possessing nuclear armaments, CPSU Central Committee General Secretary K.U. Chernenko expressed the readiness to come to an agreement that "the reduction of nuclear armaments as far as their complete elimination in all their varieties be sought step by step, on the basis of the principle of identical security."

And, if it really wants peace and mutual understanding, the U.S. side must also take this path.

SEMEYKO HITS U.S. QUEST FOR 'SUPERIORITY'

PM230948 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 16 Mar 84 Second Edition p 1

[Lev Semeyko "International Review": "Against the United States' Nuclear Arguments"]

[Text] American policy has always and in everything been characterized by double standards. They are particularly in evidence nowadays. On the one hand, the American leaders' unctuous words about their desire for peace and disarmament pour forth as from a cornucopia. On the other hand, we see a real militarist policy whose material foundation is the unprecedented arms race. Peace-loving rhetoric cannot hide Washington's true aims.

The American leaders give countless sworn assurances of the supposedly defensive nature of American war preparations. However, the fact is that these preparations are of an offensive and aggressive nature, whether it is a question of a nuclear or conventional arms buildup. Transatlantic politicians and strategists are well aware that the nuclear arsenals accumulated by the United States are more than enough to ensure the publicized aims of defense. Their further accumulation is simply senseless. But from the viewpoint of the White House and the Pentagon there is "sense" in it: If not only invulnerable but also highly accurate nuclear arms systems are created, then it will be possible in the not so distant future to disarm the USSR with a sudden first strike.

And so a complex of many thousands of nuclear first-strike -- yes, precisely first-strike, not counterstrike -- facilities is being created. They include both strategic facilities -- MX, Trident II, and long-rang cruise missiles -- and "Eurostrategic" facilities -- the Pershings and Tomahawks alrady being deployed in Europe. Starting in June this year, it is also planned to install cruise missiles on warships in the Pacific -- which could inflame the situation still more. The first B-1B strategic bomber will appear in December. The large-scale rearmament in delivery vehicles is accompanied by the creation of new nuclear warheads. In the seventies three nuclear warheads were being added to the American nuclear arsenal every day. In the eighties it is planned to produce at least 17,000 nuclear charges, including more than 1,000 neutron charges. And all this, you see, "in the name of peace"!

A qualitatively new stage of the American nuclear arms race is also evidenced by the Pentagon's desire to turn space into an arena of military operations. The United States has already begun tests of the ASAT antisatellite system designed to destroy targets in earth orbit.

The plans to create an ABM shield over America are also presented as "defensive." But this, too, is false if you consider the guidelines of American military doctrine on taking the initiative in the use of nuclear weapons. The U.S. strategic nuclear forces "must enable the President to take the initiative (!) in resorting to the use of nuclear weapons for violent, albeit politically defensive (?!) purposes," C. Gray, counsel to the American leadership, for example, states evasively.

The race for nuclear and space arms is supplemented by the race for conventional means of armed struggle. The campaign to "sooth" world public opinion includes assurances that the United States, being opposed to nuclear war, is supposedly seeking to build up traditional conventional arms, which do not threaten universal destruction. But this, too, is a lie. First, present conventional weapons are far from what they were in the last world war. Their destructive capability is many times greater and is already frequently comparable with the potential of nuclear weapons. And it is precisely on the creation of weapons of greater destructive power and other latest means that the Pentagon is placing the emphasis. Second, emphasis is also being placed on introducing into service weapons of increased range and accuracy -- which could both widen the scope of combat operations (from the very beginning, moreover) and enhance the effectiveness of strikes. And this is the purpose of the "Rogers plan," named for its author -- the supreme commander in chief, NATO Allied Armed Forces, Europe -- and adopted by that bloc's member states. This plan was once again supported at the December session of the NATO Military Planning Committee. And yet it provides for the waging of an aggressive war: the infliction of a massive preemptive (!) strike at great depth.

At that session the U.S. defense secretary submitted a list of approximately 30 types of new conventional weapons which can already be put into production. In all, the United States intends to supply the troops with more than 400 new systems of weapons and combat hardware, thereby carrying out a fundamental modernization of armaments. This, it is said, could raise the "nuclear threshold," that is, the point at which nuclear weapons begin to be employed; and, according to Weinberger, "revolutionize" the conduct of combat operations in Europe in the next few years.

However, the Western press rightly points out that the intensification of preparations for conventional war certainly cannot prevent it from escalating into a nuclear war with all its catastrophic consequences. Even a conventional war would in itself result in colossal destruction and losses if you take into account the change in its nature compared with the past. The consequences would be all the more catastrophic because the use of chemical weapons during it is envisaged. With the start of the production of a new variety of chemical weapon (binary nerve gases) next year Washington is planning to make a "contribution to the cause of peace" in this sphere, too.

The U.S. leaders declare that the buildup of their military might pursues the aim of "restoring the equilibrium of forces." And yet the equilibrium of military forces between the United States and the USSR and between NATO and the Warsaw Pact in both nuclear and conventional might is an objective fact. There can be just one purpose for pursuing an accelerated arms race under the conditions of the established equilibrium -- to achieve superiority. Not only was this aim openly proclaimed in the Republican Party's election platform in 1980 ("to ensure total military and technological superiority over the Soviet Union") but it is also being actively realized. The present rhetoric about the need to maintain equilibrium certainly does not signify the abandonment of such a course. It is mere lip service to the current circumstances and takes account of the need to substantiate the arms race more flexibly and to portray the administration as a "dove" and thereby win the votes of voters who are concerned over Reagan's military policy in the elections due this fall.

The totally uncontrolled buildup of military might was and still is the alpha and omega of the American policy of military superiority. It was not accident that the United States voted at the United Nations against the resolutions for a nuclear arms freeze and the prevention of an arms race in space, that is, against key measures in curbing the buildup of military potentials. "There can be serious talks on disarmament, but only after we have built up our forces," P. Nitze declared in 1981. To a question as to when that would be, he replied: "In 10 years." But now he maintains that the United States held "serious talks" in Geneva. Deception and hypocrisy are in evidence!

If we try to characterize graphically the buildup of the measures being taken in the United States to strengthen its mailed fist (it cannot be hidden in any velvet gloves!), we can recall the figures for military appropriations. Their growth rate speaks for itself. Agreement was reached at the May 1978 NATO Council session on a 3-percent increase in military spending in real terms. The present American Administration has increased the growth rate of the U.S. military budget to 12-14 percent a year.

To stop spinning the flywheel of the arms race means to make a decisive contribution to preventing a nuclear catastrophe. This is the central task today and the chief aim of Soviet foreign policy. At the same time the USSR is undertaking everything necessary to protect its vital interests in the defense sphere. The Soviet defensive countermeasures are of an enforced nature. Precisely: enforced. We will allow no one to upset the military-strategic equilibrium -- neither via the limitation nor via the buildup of armaments. At the same time the way to constructive talks is, as before, open. As K.U. Chernenko, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, declared, "by deploying missiles in Europe the Americans have created obstacles to talks not only on 'European' but also on strategic nuclear weapons. The removal of these obstacles (which would also remove the need for our countermeasures) -- this is the way to elaborate a mutually acceptable accord."

The CPSU Central Committee February (1984) Plenum graphically demonstrated the Soviet Union's desire to strive unswervingly and consistently to prevent nuclear war and to strengthen security on the planet.

The international public rightly evaluates as useful for the cause of peace the just ended visit to Moscow by a delegation of the Bundestag (FRG) faction of the Social Democratic Party of Germany, headed by H. -J. Vogel, which was received by Comrade K.U. Chernenko. The Soviet side emphasized the USSR's readiness to reach agreement on limiting and reducing nuclear arms.

All in all, the U.S. Administration has many opportunities for proving its love of peace not with words but with action.

USSR DEPLOYS NEW MISSILES IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA

NC221845 Paris AFP in English 1826 GMT 22 Mar 84

[Text] Prague, March 22 (AFP) -- The Soviet Union has deployed new missiles in Czechoslovakia, in line with an announcement made last year, Prime Minister Lubomir Strougal told Parliament here.

But he did not indicate the exact nature of the weapons nor when and where they were installed.

The move was "to maintain the equilibrium and thus the security of all Europe," Mr Strougal said.

Moscow had announced October 24 that it would deploy new missiles in Czechoslovakia and East Germany in response to NATO deployment of intermediate-range nuclear missiles.

Western military sources here said the new weapons were probably a brigade of SS-12 scaleboard missiles, with ranges of from 500 to 900 kms (300 to 550 miles) and each capable of carrying a one-kiloton nuclear charge.

From 3,000 to 4,000 men were in the brigade, which had 12 trucks launchers. This unit was sent from the Carpathians in the Soviet Union to Moravia in Czechoslovakia, the sources said.

They added that the SS-12's were not an increase in Warsaw Pact capacity. The Soviet Union had simply drawn some of its forces closer to the border with the West, giving the missiles a wider range in Western Europe.

ZAMYATIN CITED ON MISSILES, ARMS TALKS

LD222356 Moscow World Service in English 2010 GMT 22 Mar 84

[Text] The head of the International Information Department of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party, Leonid Zamyatin, has contributed an article to the weekly MOSCOW NEWS. We follow with the highlights of the article.

The present international situation, he writes, is a source of concern to parliamentary and government circles, to international organizations and to the public. We are alarmed by the developments in Lebanon, in the region of the Hormuz Strait and in Central America, where one of the great powers denies small countries an opportunity to exercise their right to developing along the path they have chosen for themselves.

We cannot be calm over the future of our continent, Europe, either. For nearly 2 years the Soviet Union conducted a dialogue in Geneva on limiting nuclear weapons in Europe, hoping for a mutually acceptable solution till the last day. The Soviet Union advanced one proposal after another, seeking compromise. It took unilateral measures to promote agreement. And what line did our partner follow? He was busy preparing for the deployment of missiles, rejecting versions offered to him while himself failing to make any proposals acceptable for the other side. The only drafts advanced concerned a unilateral disarmament of the Soviet Union. Is there any use in a dialogue in which one side is engaged in empty verbal exercises while outside the conference room a rearmament program is being carried into life? Such a dialogue, if one may call it that, is of no use to the international community.

The Soviet Union advocates a genuine dialogue, equal and constructive. We suggest, Leonid Zamyatin goes on to say, that all the nuclear powers undertake, just as the Soviet Union has already done unilaterally, not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. Together with the other socialist countries, we propose the conclusion of a treaty on the mutual non-use of military force and on the maintenance of relations of peace between the Warsaw Treaty and NATO countries. There is no doubt that realization of these proposals would help disperse the feelings of mutual distrust and make the present crisis situation healthier. And what do we hear in reply?

Nothing but excuses, similar to the one that the point banning the use of force is already recorded in the UN Charter and a number of other documents. This, incidentally, does not prevent certain countries from using force in the Middle East and in Central America.

What we suggest is not duplicating articles in the UN Charter but concluding a document binding the signatories to renounce the use of both nuclear and conventional weapons and also to renounce the use of force in general.

We advocate a simple and at the same time effective move, to freeze weapons on a global scale, restricting the process at the start to the Soviet Union and the United States. Such a move suggests itself since it wouldn't call for any lengthy negotiations, if of course there is goodwill and preparedness to put a barrier in the way of the avalanche of nuclear armaments. We have made concrete proposals on what should be done to preclude the use of force from outer space and in outer space, and we propose opening a discussion of this problem without delay.

There is a Soviet proposal calling for the complete elimination of chemical weapons, including the removal of such weapons from Europe.

A year ago the Soviet delegation at the Vienna talks tabled a detailed draft agreement on mutual cuts in troops and arms in Central Europe, yet the draft has been unanswered till this day.

At the Stockholm conference the Soviet Union has proposed a whole package of large-scale, not only narrow technical measures, to build confidence.

We do not regard our proposals as the only proof in its final stage. We are ready to consider other ideas and proposals from those who display preparedness to look for a solution to the pressing problems, and to do everything to ensure real moves toward real disarmament, which is what the entire international community expects from countries above all. Unfortunately we almost encounter no reciprocity in this.

Meanwhile, the present situation requires a peaceful contribution, effort and initiative from every country. The Soviet Union, as Konstantin Chernenko has stressed, will fully cooperate with all countries which are prepared by concrete deeds to help lessen international tension and create an atmosphere of trust in the world.

The Soviet proposals designed to lower the level of nuclear confrontation in Europe remain fully in force, Leonid Zamyatin says. We are for a safe Europe, for a Europe without nuclear weapons -- either medium-range or tactical. It is essential to heed the voice of reason and stop undermining European and general peace by rearmament. It is essential to stop breaking the military strategic parity and seeking the unachievable in military superiority.

It should be clearly said that the presence of Pershings and cruise missiles in Western Europe, which has already led to the failure of the Geneva talks, remains to be a serious obstacle to a renewal of the dialogue on nuclear armaments.

This is the reason why we urge the United States to return to the situation when there were no U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe. In such a case we would renounce our reciprocal measures. That would open the prospect of dialogue on these types of weapons.

At a meeting with the chairman of the Social Democratic faction in Federal Germany's Parliament, Hans-Jochen Vogel, the general secretary of the Soviet Communist Party, Konstantin Chernenko, said that we advocate a return to the former situation not for considerations of prestige. We simply do not want the military danger in Europe or elsewhere to grow further. In other words we proceed from the interests of consolidating peace, he said.

We believe that the international community will eventually succeed by joint effort in making international relations healthier. We do not think that East and West are doomed to a total confrontation or, the more so, to something still worse. What can bring about a turn for the better is first of all concrete deeds, productive solutions, concerted actions by the countries of the East and West. The Soviet Union is prepared for this.

Those were the highlights of an article contributed by Leonid Zamyatin, head of the International Information Department of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party, to the weekly MOSCOW NEWS.

CHERVOV ON U.S. ARMS TREATY 'VIOLATIONS'

PM221449 Madrid EL PAIS in Spanish 15 Mar 84 p 6

[Article by "USSR Armed Forces Chief of Staff" Nikolay Chervov: "The United States and Arms Limitation"]

[Text] The Soviet press published a memorandum 30 January which reflects the U.S. Administration's negative approach to the problem of arms limitation, citing specific instances of the violation and nonobservance of existing commitments. Bilateral and international treaties and agreements have been torpedoed by this dangerous conduct.

In its 3 years in power the Reagan administration has concluded not a single arms limitation agreement with the Soviet Union. On the contrary, what it has done is to sabotage what was achieved previously. It has rejected the SALT II treaty and refused to ratify the Treaty on Underground Nuclear Weapon Tests (1974) and the Treaty on Nuclear Explosions for Peaceful Purposes (1976).

For instance, the White House wrecked SALT II for the mere reason that this document endorsed the approximate parity in strategic arms between the USSR and the United States. If it had ratified it, it would have been much more difficult for the Reagan administration to shout from the rooftops everywhere about Soviet military superiority, which, as is well known, does not exist. The treaty would thus have reduced the chances for spurring on the arms race and stirring up war hysteria.

Eleven Instances of Nonobservance

The Americans have also unilaterally discontinued the negotiations on a universal and complete ban on nuclear weapon tests, limitation of military activity in the Indian Ocean, antisatellite systems, and a whole set of other negotiations, including those which were opened on the initiative of the Americans themselves.

The United States is not observing the commitments undertaken in the sphere of arms limitation in at least 11 specific instances. Breaking the SALT II treaty, the United States is carrying out the deployment of long-range cruise missiles, based on land and at sea, and is thus not keeping to the pledge to negotiate the limitation of such arms with the Soviet Union. The pledge not to evade the SALT II treaty in any way is also being violated. For instance, having begun deployment of the Pershing II and medium-range cruise missiles in West Europe, the United States is upsetting the established balance of strategic forces, since those U.S. missiles are strategic arms as far as the USSR is concerned.

If carried out, the decision announced by President Reagan to create an entensive antimissile defense system would lead to the torpedoing of the ABM Treaty, and in general would call into question the very possibility of achieving effective agreements in the sphere of strategic arms in the future.

With respect to other treaties, too, clear violations of the commitment undertaken have taken place. On more than one occasion, the United States has exceeded the yield limits for underground nuclear explosions laid down by the 1974 treaty. The United States has not adopted the necessary measures to prevent the release of radioactive debris outside its national territory, which violates the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water (1963).

The U.S. press (THE NEW YORK TIMES, THE WASHINGTON POST) sometimes reports on the secret underground nuclear tests of low-yield charges (from 1 to 10 kilotons) which are carried out at a range in Nevada. The number of such explosions is increasing from year to year. They are being carried out to test small nuclear explosive devices for use in the nuclear bombardment laser which is planned to be used an as antimissile weapon from space, as well as for multiple warheads. No official notifications of these explosions are given.

A cave-in occurred 15 February at Rainier Mesa (Nevada), following an explosion carried out 400 meters under ground. A large crater formed on the surface and workers on the test range fell in, 15 of whom were hospitalized, some of them in critical condition. During the explosion, U.S. seismologists recorded shocks similar to an earthquake of 4.5 on the Richter scale. The world press states that on previous occasions, during similar explosions in Nevada, cracks were formed in the earth's crust through which radioactive dust escaped at ground level.

It was recently disclosed that the United States used toxic substances on a massive scale during its aggression in Indochina. Over 2 million Vietnamese were affected, as well as over 60,000 U.S. troops and several tens of thousands of Australians, Canadians, New Zealanders, and people of other nationalities; tropical forests over an area of 150,000 hectares, 44 percent of agricultural land, and 70 percent of coconut plantations were destroyed.

The United States is now compounding its responsibility for this by sabotaging the attainment of an effective agreement on banning chemical weapons and on destroying chemical weapons stockpiles, and is at the same time boosting the manufacture of a new generation of effective toxic chemical agents (binaries).

PROCEEDINGS OF DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE NOTED

LD221934 Moscow TASS in English 1804 GMT 22 Mar 84

[Text] Geneva March 22 TASS -- TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Korzhev reports: The Conference on Disarmament has begun to discuss one of the more pressing issues on the agenda -- the prevention of the arms race in outer space.

At the request of the Soviet delegation the draft treaty of the prohibition of the use of force in outer space and from space against earth, which the Soviet Union had tabled at the 38th session of the United States General Assembly, was circulated today as the conference's working document. As is known, this draft won the approval of the overwhelming majority of the delegations attending the General Assembly and evoked broad political response throughout the world.

The international community is alarmed about U.S. militarist programs directed at unleashing the arms race in outer space. The development of anti-satellite systems is being completed and their testing has already begun. Work is continuing to develop laser weapons. The Pentagon has assigned an important role in its plans to shuttle re-usable spacecraft. The plan of developing a large-scale space-based anti-missile system, which was announced by the American Administration in March last year and which aims to create the capability to deal a first nuclear strike with impunity, is a source of special concern.

The foreign policy cover for those plans has been provided by the U.S. policy of blocking the talks: Washington's unilateral renunciations of dialogue with the USSR on anti-satellite weapons and its opposition to efforts by most states participating in the Conference on Disarmament to set up a special committee for conducting concrete talks on this issue on the order of the day. All this has been subordinated to the task of preventing the elaboration of a corresponding international agreement.

The principled policy line of the USSR and other countries of the socialist community differs radically from this obstructionist stand of the United States and its main allies.

Presenting the Soviet draft treaty today, leader of the USSR delegation Viktor Israelyan pointed out that U.S. consent to measures to prevent the arms race from spreading to outer space would confirm Washington's peaceableness, of which White House spokesman are assuring the world today. Thereby the United States would be able to make a contribution to the enhancement of peace. The basis for elaborating such measures exists -- it is the balanced international agreement which was drafted by the Soviet Union and which takes into account the legitimate interests of all sides. The USSR proposes a ban on the testing and deployment of any space-based weapons, a full and radical solution to the problem of satellite-killer weapons and the prohibition of the testing and use of manned spaceships for military purposes.

Dugersurengiyn Erdembilag, head of the delegation from the Mongolian People's Republic, recalled words by General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Konstantin Chernenko who had called for "not transferring the nuclear arms race to a new sphere, including outer space". The USSR's pledge not to be the first to launch any kind of anti-satellite weapons in space was another concrete demonstration of its goodwill, the speaker said.

Swedish representative Rolf Ekeus stressed that the Soviet draft contained many important points and went much further than the USSR's proposals of 1981 for the non-deployment of weapons of any kind in outer space.

Political observers in the Palace of Nations point out that the blend of political and legal commitments to prevent the use of force in outer space and from space against earth with measures of a material character, aimed at preventing the militarization of outer space, is an important feature of the Soviet-submitted document.

CSSR DELEGATE SPEAKS AT VIENNA MBFR TALKS

LD221624 Moscow TASS in English 1506 GMT 22 Mar 84

[Text] Vienna March 22 TASS -- In the complicated international situation, which has sharpened through the fault of the USA and the NATO bloc, whose ambition is to ensure military superiority over the USSR and the Warsaw Treaty Organization, the socialist countries are making every effort to halt further dangerous developments. This is the aim they pursue also at the Vienna talks, said Czechoslovak representative J. Sestak. He was speaking on behalf of the socialist countries at the scheduled plenary meeting of the current talks here on a mutual reduction of forces and arms in Central Europe.

But the NATO member countries, he continued, refuse to take the path of realism, of a quest for mutually acceptable decisions. An evidence of this is, in particular, the statement made by the Western side at the first plenary meeting of the current round of talks.

While disregarding in actual fact a new approach of the socialist countries, which makes it possible to ensure determined progress of talks and start in actual fact a reduction in the level of military confrontation in Central Europe, the NATO member states continue insisting on their approach aimed at ensuring unilateral military advantages over the USSR and the Warsaw Treaty Organization. The hopelessness of this approach was repeatedly pointed out by the socialist countries and borne out by the very course of the talks in connection with the discussion on figures, on which the West insists.

Moreover, it is astonishing that while recognising the significance of the contribution already made by the socialist countries for ending the deadlock at the talks, the Western participants do nothing on their part for reaching mutually acceptable agreement, but only expect fresh concessions from the Warsaw Treaty states.

At the same time, contrary to the mandate for the talks, on which agreement was reached, the North Atlantic bloc countries are, as before, reluctant to reduce arms, and pass over in silence such important issues of the future agreement, as, for example, setting a ceiling for the strength of the personnel of the air force, a limitation of the scale of military activities, etc.

While proposing nothing on their part for the resolution of the main issues pertaining to the limitation and reduction of troops and arms, the Western participants put to the foreground, without sound justification, the question of control, to be precise the question which is to be decided depending on reaching unanimity on the central issue at the Vienna talks.

The Czechoslovak representative said that it depends on the West now whether the way will be cleared to an agreement on a realistically mutually-acceptable basis. The NATO countries should give a serious answer to the proposal of the socialist countries, if they are really prepared to complement their declarations with practical actions.

NORMS FOR NUCLEAR POWERS' RELATIONS STRESSED

PM221534 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Mar 84 First Edition p 4

[M. Vasilyev article: "A Peace Code for the Nuclear Age. The Soviet Initiative at the Center of Attention"]

[Text] History has proved that it is impossible for states and peoples to exist without observing certain generally accepted norms.

The alternative is arbitrary rule and, ultimately, the degradation of human civilization. In the nuclear age this truth has become more obvious than ever before. The very existence of this civilization is now at stake.

The whole world has welcomed with enormous interest the election speech by K.U. Chernenko, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, which expressed the Soviet Union's readiness to reach agreement with other nuclear powers on the joint recognition of norms governing relations between these states and on making such norms mandatory. This initiative is also being supported by a number of eminent politicians in the West. An example of this can be seen in the statement made at a Moscow press conference by West German Social Democratic leader Vogel. The fact that an official and categorical "no" to this Soviet initiative has not come from either Washington or the capitals of other nuclear powers is also indicative. Even the opponents of this initiative are resorting to some variation of silence or adopting positions of "doubt." It is obvious that in this way they hope to avoid the need to put forward their own proposals and join in an honorable contest of arguments.

Let us examine carefully the subject of these "doubts." Questions are being raised primarily about the actual need to establish norms of relations between nuclear powers since, it is claimed, the UN Charter is in existence. True, the fundamental principles of international law enshrined in this document -- noninterference in internal affairs, respect for sovereignty, and equal right of states -- have been, are, and will remain the unshakable foundation on which relations between all countries in the world -- large and small, nuclear and nonnuclear -- must be built. It must not be forgotten, however, that the UN Charter was written at a time when mankind did not yet know the meaning of nuclear weapons. Logic prompts the need for rules of interstate behavior which would, on the basis of the UN Charter's principles, concretize these principles in conformity with the situation arising from the threat of nuclear war and in pursuit of the goal of averting this danger.

People sometimes ask: Will not the adoption of certain norms of behavior by the nuclear powers lead to the granting of special status to these powers and to their isolation from the community of world states? This question is far from simple. Two different and essentially diametrically opposed conclusions can be drawn from the objective fact of the existence of nuclear weapons and, consequently, of the countries possessing them. The first conclusion elevates these weapons to the status of an absolute which gives its owner special rights and privileges, placing him above the other states. The second conclusion is based on the premise that possession of nuclear weapons does not mean the acquisition of some special rights but, on the contrary, imposes special responsibilities. And it is the enormous responsibility borne by the state leaders of nuclear powers to present and future generations that Comrade K.U. Chernenko's discussed with full determination.

The Soviet Union is not an advocate of the world's mechanical division on "nuclear grounds" and rejects the concept of "superpowers" in opposition to the rest of the world. The socialist countries' approach to the problems of nuclear weapons, while according with their national interests, also corresponds to the interests of all states in the world and the interests of all mankind, since we are talking about no more and no less than its survival.

Let us move on to the actual norms of mutual relations between nuclear powers as proposed by the Soviet Union.

"To regard the prevention of nuclear war as the main objective of foreign policy. To prevent situations fraught with nuclear conflict. In the event of such a danger emerging, to conduct urgent consultations to prevent nuclear conflagration from breaking out" -- these are the provisions of the first norm.

"To regard the prevention of nuclear war as the main objective of foreign policy." This means that other aspects of foreign policy must be subordinated to this goal and that all foreign policy must be structured so that the task of preventing nuclear war occupies the central and determining position in it. How far removed from this, unfortunately, is the present U.S. Administration's approach to the problems of war and peace, an approach expressed with barrackroom frankness even by former U.S. Secretary of State Haig in a sentence which became notorious right away: "There are more important things than peace."

The Soviet proposals also include a specific measure providing for urgent consultations in the event of the danger of a nuclear conflagration emerging. Consultations are, of course, always important in the event of international complications. But it is the urgency of holding consultations in the event of a threatening nuclear conflagration, given its swiftness, that offers the opportunity to prevent conflict by talks before the missiles are launched on their deadly and irreversible flight.

The USSR proposal to renounce the propaganda of such war in any of its variations is organically linked with the task of preventing a nuclear war. This is because such propaganda gets people accustomed to thinking the unthinkable -- the permissibility of nuclear conflict, be it global or supposedly "limited." Such ideas are being systematically promoted in the United States and even in other NATO countries. There is no need to speak in detail about the fact that the danger of a nuclear war being unleashed remains so long as belief in the possibility of conducting and winning such a war is nurtured, so long as the conviction that such a war leads to a catastrophic nuclear escalation and mutual destruction is not universally held. This is why it is necessary to put an end to ill-intentioned propaganda which promotes a feeling of unjustified optimism regarding the prospect of victory in a nuclear war among some people, and a state of fatalism and despair among others.

The following norm proposed by the Soviet Union is also of exceptionally great importance: "To undertake not to be the first to use nuclear weapons." The pledge given unilaterally by our country on this account is widely known. This is an unprecedented step, reflecting the very nature of the USSR's peace-loving foreign policy. It is well known that the United Nations has passed numerous resolutions appealing to all nuclear powers to join such an undertaking. Nevertheless, the Western powers have so far refused to follow the USSR's wise example.

U.S. spokesmen officially declare that they are supposedly against the first use of any weapons and that they would use nuclear weapons only for "defensive purposes," in cases when conventional weapons would prove "inadequate." In the first place, however, where is the guarantee that someone in the Pentagon will not consider that the conventional pistol is inadequate and that the time has come to be the first to fire the nuclear pistol. Secondly, why is it, if the policy of the United States and its NATO allies is defensive, that they so stubbornly refuse to conclude a treaty, proposed by the socialist community countries, on the mutual nonuse of military force and the maintenance of peaceful relations, a treaty precluding the use of both nuclear and conventional weapons?

Appreciation of the realities of the nuclear age is gradually making headway in the West. Some U.S. politicians far removed from pacifism have started talking in favor of renouncing the first use of nuclear weapons, among them former Secretary of Defense McNamara, former National Security Adviser Bundy, the man whose name is linked with the start of the cold war, Kennan, and former head of the U.S. delegation at the SALT talks Smith.

Many other U.S. politicians -- senators and congressmen -- have also spoken in favor of such a step. Even former U.S. Secretary of State Kissinger, in a recent interview with TIME magazine, sounds doubtful about the advisability of maintaining -- under conditions of equality of forces -- NATO's official "flexible response" concept based on the possibility of the first use of nuclear weapons. "It is impossible to convince people that mutual suicide is a rational option," he concluded, although he still upholds conclusions which contradict this premise. The path to preventing the use of nuclear weapons and preventing a nuclear war lies through awareness of the hopelessness of the use of such weapons.

The norms proposed by the USSR go on to provide: "Not to use nuclear weapons under any circumstances against nonnuclear countries on whose territory there are no such weapons. To respect the status of the nuclear-free zone already created and to encourage the creation of new nuclear-free zones in various areas of the world."

Let us recall that, by the Tlatlelco treaty, the Latin American countries proclaimed their territory to be a nuclear-free zone and were given the corresponding guarantees by the nuclear powers. The desire to create nuclear-free zones is being voiced in the countries of Europe, Africa, the Near East, and other parts of the world. It has been embodied in resolutions adopted by the United Nations and supported by the socialist countries.

In today's conditions special significance attaches to the growing tendency to create such zones in Europe, where nuclear confrontation has reached especially dangerous proportions. Countries from the Balkan peninsula and states from Northern Europe are advocating their creation. The idea of creating a nuclear-free corridor in the center of the continent is being promoted. The differences in Soviet and U.S. policies are graphically demonstrated by the attitude toward these urgent international problems. Our country not only shows readiness to respect nuclear-free zones in different parts of Europe but also proposes that the entire continent be freed of nuclear weapons, both medium-range and tactical. Meanwhile the United States is deploying its Pershing and cruise missiles there, which is incompatible with the very idea of a nuclear-free Europe.

The code of behavior for nuclear powers, as the press describes the Soviet proposals, also provides for the prevention of "the proliferation of nuclear weapons in any form." This means primarily a pledge "not to hand over these weapons, or the control over them, to anybody." This pledge is enshrined in the Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons, whose effectiveness has successfully stood the trials of life over the years since it was signed. Not all the nuclear powers, however, have signed the treaty yet. Nor has it been signed by such countries as Israel, South Africa, and Pakistan, whose nuclear ambitions have been the subject of justified fear expressed by the world public.

The formula proposed by the USSR also provides for a pledge not to deploy nuclear weapons "on the territory of countries where there are no such weapons," which would also comply with UN recommendations. And finally -- "not to spread the nuclear arms race to new spheres, including space." We must dwell on the last issue in particular. A number of already concluded agreements contain the principle of using outer space as a nuclear-free zone. Nevertheless, the "star wars" plans preached by the present U.S. Administration are quite obviously aimed at making space, too, an arena of nuclear confrontation.

Should these plans materialize, the restoration of the peaceful nature of space would be a thousandfold more difficult that the prevention of its militarization today. It is important now, before it is too late and without encroaching on anyone's security, to exclude space from the sphere of military use.

The Soviet Union proposes: "To press step by step, on the basis of the principle of equal security, for the reduction of nuclear arms, up to their complete liquidation in all their varieties." Yes, precisely on the basis of the principle of equal security. The United States is also saying that it is supposedly in favor of the reduction of nuclear arms. It is nevertheless well known that all its relevant proposals are based on the premise of disarming the other side. A closer look shows that Washington's "zero" actually is a plus for the United States and a minus for the other side.

Comrade K.U. Chernenko's speech notes that the Soviet Union has already made these principles the foundation of its policy and is ready "to reach agreement at any time with the other nuclear powers on jointly recongnizing norms of this kind and imparting to them a mandatory character."

The Soviet initiative proposes a specific and positive program. The adoption on the proposed obligations -- not rights, not privileges, but actually obligations -- by the nuclear powers would correspond not only to their own fundamental interests but also to the interests of peoples' security all over the world.

CPSU DEPARTMENT OFFICIAL CITED ON NUCLEAR ISSUES

PM231132 Helsinki HUFVUDSTADSBLADET in Swedish 22 Mar 84 p 8

[Unattributed report: "Concrete Measures Must Follow U.S. Assurances"]

[Text] A high-ranking Soviet spokesman yesterday called on the United States to agree to the Soviet proposal for a freeze on nuclear arsenals at their present levels.

Central Committee International Information Department Deupty Chief Nikolay Chetverikov [title as published] said in a speech in Helsinki that such a move would strengthen confidence to a much greater extent than the U.S. Administration's statements in support of peace. Chetverikov quoted party chief Konstantin Chernenko's statement that the Soviet Union will only take U.S. assurances of peace seriously if they are accompanied by conrete measures.

"A freeze on nuclear arsenals would not have any effect on either side's security. On the contrary such a decision would disperse the clouds on the political horizon and help the efforts to reach an agreement on a reduction of the nuclear arsenals," he said.

He declared that the United States has set itself the goal of achieving a military advantage and that the country is striving for world domination.

Chetverikov also touched on U.S. Senator Gary Hart's successes in the U.S. presidential election campaign -- but he made no definite pronouncement on developments.

"The results of the primaries in certain states show that the U.S. Administration's irresponsible policies worry a significant section of the U.S. people. People want peace and not rearmament and war hysteria," he said.

On the plans for a nuclear-free zone in the Nordic area he repeated past Soviet assurances that the Soviet Union will not use nuclear arms against countries which become part of the zone, that the Soviet Union is prepared to guarantee the zone's status, and that it is prepared to discuss measures on its territory and the Baltic's nuclear-free status.

CEMA TRADE COMMISSION MEETS IN MOSCOW 20-22 MAR

LD222022 Moscow TASS in English 1924 GMT 22 Mar 84

[Text] Moscow March 22 TASS -- Resolutions directed at further developing the cooperation of CMEA countries in the field of foreign trade and also at protecting the interests of countries of the socialist community in conditions when the imperialist circles are pursuing a course of further aggravating the international situation, of undermining normal international political and economic relations were adopted at a regular meeting of the CMEA Standing Commission on Foreign Trade. It was held in Moscow on March 20-22.

It was stressed that CMEA member countries pursue consistently a line of developing trade and economic relations with all states which are ready to cooperate on an equal and mutually advantageous basis irrespective of level of economic development and socio-economic system.

EDITORIAL ON WARSAW PACT COUNTRIES' COOPERATION

PM221610 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 22 Mar 84 Second Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Together Toward a Common Aim"]

[Text] Man is living through a hard time. The rash, adventurist actions of the aggressive forces of imperialism, above all of U.S. imperialism, have created a serious threat today to all peoples of the world. The policy of overt militarism pursued by U.S. ruling circles and their claims to world domination, resistance to progress, and violation of the peoples' rights and freedoms have caused a sharp aggravation of international tension. Washington's overt desire for military superiority and the unprecedented arms race it has unleashed have led to the intensification of the danger of war.

Under these conditions the Soviet Union is persistently and consistently pursuing a Leninist policy of peace -- a policy aimed at sparing mankind the threat of world nuclear war, the danger of the outbreak of which has increased considerably in connection with the deployment of the U.S. first-strike missiles in West Europe. The main features of Soviet foreign policy have been defined by the decisions of recent CPSU congresses and they are in accordance with the Soviet people's fundamental interests and the interests of other peoples of the world.

The USSR is waging the struggle for international security in close cooperation with the fraternal socialist countries. Success in preserving and strengthening peace, the CPSU Central Committee February (1984) Plenum pointed out, depends considerably on the magnitude of the influence exerted by the socialist countries in the world arena and the vigor, purposefulness, and coordination of their actions. "Our countries," Comrade K.U. Chernenko said in his speech at the plenum, "are vitally interested in peace. For the sake of this goal we will seek to expand cooperation with all socialist countries. Developing and deepening cohesion and cooperation with the socialist community countries by every means -- in all spheres including, of course, the important economic sphere -- is how we are making a great contribution to the cause of peace, progress, and the peoples' security."

The socialist states' joint efforts are aimed at achieving a common single goal -- ensuring peaceful living conditions for the peoples of the whole world. It is hard to name any problem of importance for the consolidation of peace and security for which the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries have not produced specific, realistic proposals in recent years. The socialist community states' initiatives are meeting with increasing support from other countries. This was also confirmed most convincingly by the recent UN General Assembly session.

However, the complexity of the present situation and the hegemonist policy of the present U.S. Administration and the aggressive intrigues of U.S. imperialism in Central America, the Near and Middle East, and other parts of the world which Washington has arbitrarily declared to be "the sphere of its vital interests" compels us to double and treble our efforts in pursuing a policy of peace and international cooperation. The communist and workers' parties and governments of the socialist countries understand this well. The socialist states' specific purposeful actions in the world arena and their determination to do everything to prevent the threat of war are leading to the growth of their prestige in the eyes of all peoples of the world.

The socialst countries' international influence is growing and strengthening with every passing day, but the imperialist politicians are doing everything to try to restrict it. They are attempting to weaken the socialist states' cohesion, to shake the foundations of the socialist system primarily where it seems to them they can count on success. Under these conditions it is particularly important to preserve unity and to strengthen the solidarity of the fraternal socialist countries.

The leaders of the Warsaw Pact states again unanimously voiced their conviction of the need to strengthen the socialist countries' unity and cohesion during last month's [14 Feb] meeting in Moscow. This process is developing among many avenues. Political collaboration in the international arena, economic and scientific and technical cooperation, cultural ties -- all this helps the successful implementation of the great goals which the peoples of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries have set themselves. The activity of the CEMA and the Warsaw Pact organization plays a large part in developing the socialist community states' all-around cooperation.

Among the various avenues of the socialist countries' fraternal collaboration, major importance under present conditions is attached to their cooperation in the military field, in the consolidation of defense capability and the safeguarding of reliable security. The measures undertaken by the Soviet Union and its allies and friends serve to stabilize the world situation. The USSR and the other socialist community states do not need military superiority, and they do not intend to dictate their will to others. But they will not allow anyone to disrupt the military-strategic equilibrium which has been achieved. The further consolidation of the socialist countries' defense capability and the existence of a sufficient quantity of modern weapons, with whose aid the hotheads of the bellicose adventurists may be cooled, serve as an important prerequisite for preserving peace.

Ties are expanding and cooperation is strengthening between the fraternal armies of the Warsaw Pact states. This is convincingly borne out in particular by the recent exercises of units of the ground forces and air forces of the Czechoslovak People's Army, the Soviet Army, and the Hungarian People's Army on CSSR territory and the "Druzhba-84" exercises in Poland. This is also borne out by the results of the command staff exercise of the allied armies and navies codenamed "Soyuz-84", held on the territories of Bulgaria, Hungary, Romania, the southwestern regions of the Soviet Union, and the Black Sea. The further consolidation of the brotherhood-in-arms between the allied armies' servicemen is also convincingly borne out by the current official friendly visit to the Soviet Union by the GDR military delegation headed by Army General H. Hoffmann, member of the SED Central Committee Politburo and GDR minister of national defense.

Soviet servicemen welcomed wholeheartedly the words from Comrade K.U. Chernenko's speech at the meeting with the voters of Moscow's Kuybyshevskiy Electoral Okrug to the effect that "we must be concerned for the adequate security of our country and its friends and allies." They are worthily fulfilling their patriotic and international duty and in single formation with their brothers in arms -- the servicemen of the armies of the other Warsaw Pact states -- they are reliably standing guard over our peoples' revolutionary gains.

SOCIALIST STATES PARTICIPATE IN NUCLEAR MEETING

SK211356 Moscow in Korean to Korea 0930 GMT 21 Mar 84

[Text] A meeting of government representatives from Bulgaria, Hungary, GDR, Poland, Romania, Czechoslovakia, the Soviet Union, Vietnam, Cuba, the DPRK, and Mongolia -- which are participating nations in the allied nuclear research institute [yonhap haekyonguso] -- is being held in Dubna, (?near) Moscow.

The meeting is reviewing the results of last year's work at this international scientific center and discussing future plans for research work. More than 50 scholars from socialist countries are studying basic questions in the field of atomic nuclear physics [wonja haekmullihak] at the Dubna research institute.

'FABRICATIONS' ON USSR SUPPLIED CHEMICAL WEAPONS

PM201553 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 18 Mar 84 First Edition p 5

[Gennadiy Musayelyan article under the rubric "Conjectures and Facts": "Puddles for Neo-Laputans"]

[Text] In the imaginary kingdom of Laputa the minds of politicians and their Myrmidons were always absorbed by strenuous deliberation about intrigues and conspiracies by their associates. They even attempted to prove by unusual analytical methods that an ordinary broom could signify... revolution or that a broken reed, for example, could mean a court of justice... And although more than 250 years have passed since the time when the great British satirist Jonathan Swift described the customs of those islanders, who were so far removed from reality, people very similar to the Laputans can still be found in the West today.

It is true that in the far-distant times of that glorious kingdom people still knew nothing about chemical weapons. But even if the Laputans had been acquainted with them, they could have hardly managed to surpass the imagination of some journalists from the Turkish newspaper GUNES. A few days ago it published an article claiming that the USSR has supposedly supplied Iraq with chemical weapons.

Facts, proof? Nothing of the sort, naturally! As if they were anywhere to be found. After all, the Soviet Union's position with respect to chemical weapons is absolutely clear: There can be no place for such weapons on earth. Our country was one of the first to sign the 1925 Geneva protocol prohibiting the use in war of asphyxiating, poisonous, or other gases and bacteriological methods of warfare. And it has never breached this protocol, invariably striving to ensure the effectiveness of this important international document and to expand the number of its signatories to the maximum. Bilateral Soviet-U.S. talks on this question opened in 1976 on the USSR's initiative and with the world public's support. Nevertheless, despite the efforts made by the socialist states and many others states and despite UN appeals, these talks were broken off through the fault of the United States. Washington still refuses to resume them.

It must be emhasized that the United States is the main obstacle to the achievement of progress on this issue. It was the only one of the 150 UN member countries to openly disregard the world public's opinion and will and vote against the adoption of the UN General Assembly resolution. The main reason for such a reaction lies in the fact that Washington sees any agreement or talks on chemical weapons as an obstacle to its plans to expand and update these deadly arsenals, presently standing somewhere between 150,000 and 300,000 metric tons.

In a desperate attempt to confuse the issue the United States constantly spreads false conjectures and insinuations about Moscow's "yellow rain." Let us recall the "chemical rain" in Vietnam. How much noise was made in that connection by the CIA and some administration spokesmen at the time? Later they were forced to admit their utter inconsistency. U.S. scientists themselves published an article proving that the "yellow rain" was produced by... bees!

But this failed to sober up the Langley hotheads. Yet another falsification was born, this time about Soviet chemical weapons in Afghanistan. Not a bad idea, but there was only one snag: No matter how much they tried, they again failed to get hold of any proof. Meanwhile chemical weapons were actually being used in the DRA at that time, but they were American. While in Jalalabad, I held in my hands a chemical grenade. It was marked M.46.036,0652-709. "Federal Laboratories. Pennsylvania, U.S.A." The address could not have been clearer, and it was confirmed by basmachis who were then captured by Afghan fighters.

But even that did not stop the liars. On 21 February the U.S. State Department set in motion the wildest fabrication that Soviet chemical weapons were allegedly used in Afghanistan, Laos, and Kampuchea. But this time the myth survived only a period of record-breaking brevity -- 24 hours in all. On 22 February THE NEW YORK TIMES published an article under the headline "United States Fails To Provide Any New Proof of Chemical Weapons Use by Russians."

And so, to the latest "sensation." This time about alleged Soviet chemical weapons in Iraq. It seems as if the publication of the article in the Turkish GUNES was far from accidental. Another typical detail must be noted: The newspaper did not publish its own report, but material borrowed from a Pentagon report.

This deliberately inspired report in GUNES and its repetition in the Iranian press and statements by Iran's official organ -- the radio and television administration (IRNA) [as published] -- occurred at a very specific moment in time. A moment in time when the Iranian troops' offensive in the direction of Basra on Iraqi territory had suffered repeated setbacks. These operations resulted in total losses of many thousands of Iranian soldiers and 12 to 15-year old mobilized militia members. It seems that the IRNA propagandists and the staffers of the military information group of the staff of the Corps of Guards of the Iranian Revolution and the Iranian Armed Forces have been unable to think up anything better to explain these unjustified victims than the Pentagon's falsification, slipped into Iranian hands by the Turkish newspaper. And the fact that some Iranian officials are trying to use this falsification in their public statements in namaz (mass prayer) and even from the rostrum of the Majles (parliment) is quite beyond the pale. And, moreover, they previously declared that Iraq was being supplied with chemical weapons by Britain and France. . . .

It would not go amiss if those who are now fanning an anti-Soviet campaign in Iran would think about and show some interest in the origin of this slander. After all, the falsification which certain forces in Iran have gotten hold of bears a stamp which is highly reminiscent of the anti-Soviet libels manufactured by official U.S. circles in connection with chemical weapons.

The U.S. press has recently written "that people in Washington were obviously mistaken from the very beginning when they accused the Soviet Union and its allies of using chemical weapons." But the origin of these "mistakes" is clear: The United States now owns the world's largest stockpiles of this means of mass destruction. In the current fiscal year the Pentagon is planning a new and vast increase in expenditure on the manufacture of deadly weapons.

. . . The inhabitants of the island of Laputa lost all reason when the rage of conjecture was upon them. According to Swift they even beat their heads against milestones. Today's neo-Laputans, as numerous facts attest, are simply wallowing in dirty puddles. . . .

NATO EXERCISES IN NORWAY LINKED TO SOVIET THREAT

PM221712 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 21 Mar 84 Second Edition p 3

[Article by Captain 2d Rank V. Kuzar under the rubric "Military-Political Commentary": "Playing With Fire"]

[Text] On the night of 16-17 March an immense area of the extreme north of Norway was enveloped in the red glow of war. Not a real one -- a training war. But everything looked just as if the "aggressor," whose role is always slanderously ascribed to the Soviet Union, had actually attacked this small Scandinavian country. Or at least the organizers of the training battle that raged here strove to give that "impression."

And it was impressive: 5,000 U.S. Marines and around 20,000 servicemen from 7 NATO countries stormed the rocky coast south of the town of Tromso. They had air support from around 200 fighters and ground-attack aircraft. For their part, 10,000 Norwegian officers and men repelled the "attack."

Simultaneously, naval battles were being fought to a similar scenario several hundred miles from the coast in the Norwegian Sea. The naval "battles" there were conducted by the U.S. aircraft carrier "Independence," two U.S. and one British helicopter carrier, ships from NATO's permanent naval task force in the Atlantic, and other warships.

Such is the scale and provacative nature of the largest NATO military maneuvers in the Arctic in the entire history of NATO's existence. As has already been reported, more than 40,000 servicemen, 150 warships, and 300 planes and helicopters have been drawn up in the region of northern Norway and its surrounding waters. This entire armada has taken part and is continuing to take part in the "Avalanche Express" and "Team Work-84" exercises.

One wonders who needs this show of military strength and why? If you listen to Norwegian Defense Ministry spokesmen the"threat of a Soviet attack" has been hanging over Norway and therefore it was urgently necessary to verify NATO's readiness to come to its aid in a "crisis situation." However, this is a most patent lie: Nobody has threatened or is threatening Norway. And broad circles of the Norwegian public realize this. As the newspaper FRIHETEN stresses, all references to the imaginery "Soviet threat" and the NATO exercises held under the cover of these references serve to hitch Norway more firmly to NATO's aggressive strategy.

It ought to be noted that with the direct connivance and collaboration of the Norwegian conservative government the NATO bloc's military-political leadership is increasingly actively turning Norway's northern regions into a major bridgehead for aggression. Airfields are being enlarged here, artillary batteries are being established, intelligence complexes are being set up, and stockpiles of arms and combat equipment are being created. Even the forces which are to operate from this bridgehead have been specified.

Among them are formations and units of U.S. Marines, in particular the 4th Brigade, which has been taking part in the maneuvers. The command does everything it can to "run in" [obkatat] brigade personnel under polar conditions and simultaneously check the combat worthiness of the equipment stored at U.S. dumps in Norway.

Similar objectives in the exercises were also pursued by the Canadian and British Armed Forces, whose military contingents were also defined by the bloc leadership as "reinforcements." The Norwegian officer J. Lund stated that the maneuvers are "the first occasion when all the important reinforcements that will come to Norway in a 'crisis situation' have taken part."

Indeed, it is a feature of the "Avalanche Express" and "Team Work-84" exercises that the U.S. and other NATO troops taking part in them are mainly functioning in their own specific regions of operation [operativnogo prednaznacheniya] or in places as near as possible to them. And the fact that they are there rehearsing offensive tasks which the aggressive NATO bloc's command is preparing to resolve under real combat conditions is especially dangerous.

Scandinavia's progressive public is following the exercises with alarm. After all, these battles, which for the moment are only training "battles" are, as the local press aptly remarked, nothing but playing with fire. That is indeed so.

SOVIET PEACE COMMITTEE MAKES APPEAL TO CDE SESSION

LD201753 Moscow TASS in English 1720 GMT 20 Mar 84

[Text] Moscow March 20 TASS -- An appeal to the participants in the Stockholm Conference on Confidence and Security Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe has been adopted by the plenary meeting here today of the Soviet Peace Committee uniting in its ranks representatives of the widest public circles of the USSR. The plenum wished the conference success and expressed the sentiments of profound concern over the facts of international realities, which seriously mar its work, prevent the development of true confidence between the countries participating in it on the basis of equal security. The point at issue is above all the deployment in the FRG, Britain and Italy of new American first nuclear missiles targeted on the USSR and the other socialist countries. Can one hope for building up confidence in each other as a result of this step, which has already led to the discontinuation of talks on the limitation of nuclear weapons, provoked a new particularly dangerous escalation of the arms race and caused, in the final analysis, a sharp aggravation of the international situation? the appeal says.

We, the appeal stresses, expect from the Stockholm conference serious and weighty agreements in the direction of strengthening and perfecting the Helsinki process, a fundamental solution to the problems of eliminating the nuclear threat. The representatives of the governments shall not miss for that new opportunities opening under the conditions of the mass anti-war movement, especially in Europe, the USA and Canada, which has unfolded in recent years. This movement will effectively support all real measures capable of eliminating the threat of nuclear war in Europe. Among such measures, the appeal says, could be, in particular, the adoption by all the nuclear states participating in the conference of the commitment never to be the first to use nuclear weapons whatever the circumstances; an agreement between the NATO and Warsaw Treaty member countries on mutual non-use of military force, including the renunciation of the first use of both nuclear and conventional weapons against each other. Such an agreement shall be open for accession by the other European states and the whole world.

The appeal names as real measures capable of eliminating the threat of nuclear war also a simultaneous freeze by all nuclear states, above all by the USSR and the USA, on nuclear weapons and their subsequent reduction down to total scrapping; complete and general prohibition of nuclear weapons tests; the creation of nuclear free zones in the north, in the centre of Europe and in the Balkans, and in the final analysis, total freeing of the European continent from nuclear weapons; freeing Europe from chemical weapons, a cut in military budgets, above all in the NATO and Warsaw treaty countries.

The Soviet peace champions call upon the participants in the Stockholm conference that they make maximum constructive efforts so that it reverse the current course of developments for the better, contribute to lessening tensions, ensuring disarmament in Europe and all over the world.

SOVIET PEACE COMMITTEE STATEMENT ON NUCLEAR WAR

LD211437 Moscow TASS in English 1403 GMT 21 Mar 84

[Text] Moscow March 20 TASS -- "The Soviet peace campaigners stand shoulder to shoulder with millions of people in all countries and continents in the struggle for peace and life and against the threat of nuclear war," says a statement of the extended plenary meeting of the Soviet Peace Committee which took place in Moscow today. The rapporteur, Yuriy Zhukov, president of the committee and a prominent Soviet journalist and author, and other speakers, among them Leonid Ilin, academician of the Academy of Medical Sciences of the USSR, Leningrader Tamara Chistyakova, a vocational training instructor, who lost all her family during the Nazi seige of Leningrad, writer Anatoliy Ananiyev, Aleksandr Subbotin, secretary of the Central Council of the Soviet trade unions, Patriach Pimen of Moscow and all-Russia and other representatives of the working class, the collective farmers and the intelligentsia, stressed that the multimillion Soviet peace movement was aware of its responsibility and acknowledged the tasks posed by the present-day complex international situation. The plenary meeting noted that last year 140,000 anti-war actions in which a total of 160 million people participated took place in the Soviet Union.

The Soviet people well understand that they are making a substantial contribution towards safeguarding and strengthening peace by their dedicated efforts in tackling the ambitious tasks of the economic and social development of the homeland.

The participants in the plenary meetings stated that the strong peace movement of the peoples had become a major factor of world politics. The deployment of new U.S. missiles in a number of West European countries that had gone ahead against the will of the peoples dramatically aggravated the international situation. However, it did not bring about a reversal in the anti-missile movement for which the ruling elite of the USA and the NATO brass had hoped. Mass actions of the peace champions show that the resolve of the peoples has not been broken. In these conditions even more importance is attached to the cohesion and solidarity of all the forces opposed to the threat of war, and also to the extensive involvement in the struggle of all the people of good will, those who realise that the very existence of mankind is at stake today.

The plenary meeting passed a resolution envisioning massive actions of Soviet peace campaigners in support of the priority demands of the anti-war movement, those for halting the further deployment of U.S. missiles in Europe and for withdrawing the new U.S. missiles already in place thus creating proper conditions for the resumption of honest and businesslike talks on the reduction of nuclear weapons. It was decided to strengthen and extend cooperation and joint or parallel actions with all the contingents of today's anti-war movement and to promote constructive dialogue with them with a view to extending mutual understanding and trust, and also to counter acts of ideological subversion and attempts to split up that movement and to augment its solidarity and cohesion. Joint actions are to be launched under the common slogans "No to nuclear weapons in Europe, in West and East!" "No to nuclear weapons anywhere in the world!" and "For disarmament and peace!"

Solidarity is to be strengthened with the peoples which have thrown off the yoke of colonialism, particularly with the peoples compelled to counter the attacks of the aggressive forces of imperialism, and active support will be given to the U.N.-sponsored worldwide campaign for disarmament.

NEWS CONFERENCE ON REAGAN'S PRC VISIT

PM231009 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 23 Mar 84 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "White House Press Conference"]

[Text] Washington March 22 TASS -- A news conference was given in the White House on President Reagan's visit to the People's Republic of China scheduled for late April. According to a spokesman for the administration, the visit should be viewed in the context of the process of the development of bilateral relations.

The talks, he said, would embrace a wide range of issues, including military cooperation between the United States and China.

The spokesman for the administration admitted that contradictions remained between the positions of the two countries on the Taiwan problem.

CAMPAIGN ISSUES, DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATES EYED

PM221108 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Mar 84 Morning Edition p 5

[Aleksandr Bovin "Political Observer's Opinion": "Battle for the White House"]

[Text] The U.S. election campaign is gaining momentum. Reagan's main trump cards are economic ones. For more than a year the indicators of U.S. economic development have been rising, albeit slowly. Inflation has been cut from 12.4 to 3.2 percent. Interest rates have fallen from more than 21 to 11 percent. There are fewer people unemployed. In the last 15 months roughly 5 million new jobs have been successfully created. That is the President's story. And he is telling the truth. But not the whole truth. Let us try to be more specific.

Last year the U.S. economy, which in 1980-1982 experienced its severest crisis since the war, really overcame the depression and embarked on a phase of revival. Only the Americans do not have Ronald Reagan to thank for this, but Karl Marx. The most experienced economists are finding it difficult to distinguish the specific effect of "Reaganomics" against the background of the usual cyclic upturn, after which a slump will inevitably follow even if Reagan were elected President for life.

Now the President's contribution. One of his main promises was to eliminate the federal budget deficit. This is the result. In fiscal 1982-1983 the deficit almost doubled in comparison with the previous fiscal year and amounted to $195.3 billion. The projected deficit for the next fiscal year is of the order of $180 billion.

Obviously feeling somewhat embarrassed, the other day the president announced a 3-year program for reducing the deficit by $148 billion. Specifically, the following is being proposed: reducing the nonmilitary part of the budget by $43 billion and the military part by $57 billion and obtaining $48 billion by closing any loopholes in the taxation system.

For the Pentagon $57 billion is a trifle. Instead of $1,061 billion it is left with "just" $1,004 billion. And that "nonmilitary part of the budget" is a new blow to the needy sections of the population. In 3 years Reagan has already cut various welfare programs by $110 billion. Here "Reaganomics" has really worked smoothly. In 1979, 26.1 million people in the United States (11.7 percent of the entire population) were living below the official poverty line. In 1983, there were 34.4 million of these people (15 percent). And, as we have seen, the slashing of social programs goes on.

Now unemployment. Of the 5 million new jobs that Reagan mentioned the unemployed "obtained" around 3 million. Thus, 9.2 million people (8.2 percent of the workforce) are still out of work. Add to that up to 2 million citizens who, according to U.S. assessments, have, in despair, stopped looking for work (and have consequently disappeared for official statistics purposes). Plus almost 6 million people who have been put on reduced hours.

It is said that figures are a bore. And yet I have ventured to refer to U.S. statistics. Because without knowing the precise economic facts it is hard to find the beef in the U.S. election battles. Judging by U.S. forecasts the upturn will continue for the entire year. And Reagan will undoubtedly squeeze all he can, and then some, out of an economic situation that is to his advantage. He is an expert at doing that.

But the Democrats too have a good opportunity for some sniping at clearly visible targets. The trouble is that the Democrats lack a precise, universally understood, constructive, and specific program for righting the economy. The economic policy they are proposing is diffuse, amorphous, and reminiscent of a mosaic composed of little bits of various schools of thought and approaches.

It is a different situation in the sphere of foreign policy. Here the President is short of trump cards to play. There is confusion in relations with the allies, who increasingly often are doubting the present administration's ability to grasp the complexities of international life and make the correct decisions. There is clear alienation in relations with dozens of nonaligned states, which see the United States as one of the main obstacles along the path of creating a new international economic order based on equality and justice. There is the Lebanon failure. The Central America quagmire. And finally, the sharp deterioration in relations with the Soviet Union that frightens everyone. The President has spent further hundreds of billions of dollars on arming America. But has this strengthened U.S. security? Has the country moved nearer to lasting peace? Americans are responding in the negative to these questions with increasing frequency. The fear of nuclear war has ceased to be an abstract feeling; it has, as it were, spread through all levels of public awareness.

The Democrats' positions are more precise and definite on international questions. The U.S. Democratic Party's draft election manifesto on national security problems that has been prepared by a special committee proposes radical changes in the foreign policy course. The resumption of normal relations with the USSR gets top billing. Great attention is devoted to ending the arms race. It is admitted that the United States, like the Soviet Union, must announce its renunciation of a first use of nuclear weapons. By present U.S. standards it is an extremely far-reaching document. That the Democratic Party convention may cut out its most jarring aspects is not ruled out. But on the whole Democrats counter the belligerence and adventurism of R. Reagan with foreign policy, which is rooted in common sense, in a consideration of the realities and dangers of our time, and in a realization that America will only be secure when the Soviet Union is secure.

Reagan and his advisers realize that the dangerous formula "Reagan Means War!" is being bandied about. It is no accident that the President has been saying so much about peace, negotiations, and disarmament in recent months. The image of the wild cowboy is hurriedly being replaced by the image of the wise statesman concerned to avert a war. What if the voters do not believe it? Then, as the U.S. newspapers are writing, there is another option, termed the "October surprise," in reverve.

It will be recalled that most Americans applauded the occupation of Grenada. The same chauvinist complex that Reagan exploited to the limit in 1980 has been at work. Well just look at the "great and mighty" America! It's even managed to conquer Grenada. Hence the "October surprise" idea -- a new Grenada -- which must be offered on the eve of the elections.

And then a wave of chauvinism will sweep up all the whiners, doubters, and scaredy-cats...Of course, it is an extremely risky business. But who has plumbed the depths of human stupidity and presumption?

Reagan's immense strength is his personal attractiveness, his ability to be just the way people want to see him. In the TV age this is not just a "subjective factor" but the most objective and politically significant reality. The indomitable optimism, the ostentatiously emphasized confidence, the permanent mask of the regular, good-natured guy -- all this impresses the "average American." Much is said and written about the fact that Reagan is not weighed down by erudition and culture, reads virtually nothing, spends his evenings in front of the television, does not overwork himself, confuses facts, names, and events, and so on and so forth. And here is the paradox. What is a minus from the standpoint of a more or less developed political culture becomes a plus in the eyes of that "average American" who is pleased that the President is not some intellectual or Harvard know-it-all, but a down-to-earth, unsophisticated guy like himself.

The Democrats will not outdo Reagan in that area. And criticism, even convincing criticism, of Reagan's policy will not help, or rather it will help, but not decisively. A comprehensible, inspiring alternative is needed. New ideas are needed. This has been sensed and understood by Gary Hart.

Many people are currently discussing the "Hart phenomenon," that is, his unexpected success in several states, a success which has made him second to Mondale as the Democratic Party's potential candidate. The reasons for this success are generating arguments. The LOS ANGELES TIMES thinks that G. Hart's success is explained "more by his good looks than by the content of his speeches. His victory is ensured by the diffuseness of his statements and his unusual approach to topical problems: He can be just the way the voters would like to see him at any given moment." Other observers lay greater stress on the "unusual approach" than on the looks.

Thus far it is difficult to say what G. Hart thinks about domestic affairs. In my opinion, his statements contain something in common with the programs of the numerous "ecology groups" or "greens" as they are called in Europe. In foreign policy the candidate is more definite. He thinks that "it is hardly advisable to raise our voices and set the guns off...The people want the country to do more politically and less militarily and the government to work more with brain than brawn." In the opinion of such an expert and virtual prophet as J. Reston, Hart places foreign policy at the center of his attack on Reagan, "and considering the President's record, that could turn out to be a winning strategy..."

Not that W. Mondale is thinking of quitting the game. His views are devoid of extravagance. Americans are well acquainted with this middle-of-the-road liberalism. He has marvelously organized election machine behind him. He has money behind him. He has significantly greater experience behind him. So G. Hart's star could fall just as easily as it has risen. But in the meantime the public bickering between the contenders (apart from Mondale and Hart there is only J. Jackson left) is working to the Republican's advantage.

A few general observations in conclusion. In my opinion, conservatism in the United States has already peaked. Reagn's mass base is starting to contract. In an attempt to get control of the situation the President is moving away from conservative rhetoric increasingly often and toward political pragmatism. But his prestige is still quite high.

However, the election is not today, but some 7 months away. And the Democrats have a real chance. It is all a question of whether they will be able to make use of their chance.

U.S. 'UNWORTHY POLICY' ON DIALOGUE EFFORTS

LD220059 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 21 Mar 84

[From the Vremya program: video "commentary" by Eduard Mnatsakanov, Central Television political observer, entitled "On Genuine Dialogue and Imaginary Dialogue"]

[Text] Hello, comrades. Speaking at a press conference, George Shultz, head of the U.S. Department of State, once again reassured the public in every way of the United States' readiness to enter into negotiations with the Soviet Union. Following Shultz, Assistant Secretary of State Burt even talks abut drawing the USSR into a realistic dialogue. In Washington there is talk about dialogue, but so far not a single step has been taken or proposal made in this direction. The Soviet Union, for its part, has put forward a whole range of large-scale, realistic, and constructive measures for consideration, the acceptance of which would represent a cardinal step towards consolidating trust between states and improving the entire international situation.

In his pre-election speech on 2 March Comrade Chernenko formulated the norms of relations between nuclear powers. Among these norms are the following principles: Preventing nuclear war, abandoning nuclear war propaganda, pledging not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, not using nuclear weapons against nonnuclear countries under any circumstances, respecting the status of the nuclear-free zone that has already been created and stimulating the creation of new nuclear-free zones, and not disseminating nuclear weapons and reducing the number of them on the basis of equal security.

These principles have long been at the foundations of our country's policy. However, they should become the norm in the building of relations between nuclear powers -- a genuine code of relations between states, as the world press has called them. This is a noble and humane code. It corresponds to the interests not just of the participating countries, but also of all peoples on earth. The norms of relations between states put forward by the Soviet leader concentrate, as it were, the most important initiatives that the Soviet Union made even earlier, in the 1970's. We proposed to other nuclear powers, for instance, that an agreement be reached on the nonuse of nuclear weapons against nonnuclear countries on the territory of which there are no such weapons under any circumstances. This idea has met and meets with universal understanding and approval.

By the way, in the 1970's the United States also subscribed to this and certain other principles that constitute the code of relations between states proposed by the Soviet Union. Why should Washington be silent now? It is to be assumed that the stand of the USSR is well known to President Reagan and to Shultz and other U.S. national figures. On 6 March an official White House representative stated that the Soviet Leader's speech would be carefully studied. But is this not taking too long? Why is it that Washington, which is so fond of holding forth on the norms of conduct of states when it is a question of attempting to interfere in someone else's affairs, now does not wish to respond to a call that is permeated with a spirit of good will, and cooperation and striving for the peace and security of people.

The Soviet Union does not make any claims to have some exclusive right here [isklyuchtelnost]. We are willing to consider other counterproposals, provided there is a sincere desire to seek a solution to the pressing issues. Instead, there is empty talk in Washington about readiness for dialogue, but not a word about Soviet proposals. And Washington has put forward no proposals of its own. Tactics of this sort could, perhaps, be called a policy, but it is an unworthy policy. It cannot set in motion the settlement of any single one of the problems facing mankind today.

U.S. NUCLEAR WAR PLANS TIED TO FOREIGN POLICY

LD222031 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 22 Mar 84

[Text] NEW YORK TIMES has published a lengthy report which describes in detail the Pentagon's so-called military games based on the use of nuclear weapons. Here is a news commentary. Our political observer Aleksandr Zholkver is at the microphone.

To start with I shall point out that the report in THE NEW YORK TIMES is not especially sensational. It is quite well known that the official doctrine of the U.S. Defense Deaprtment is based on the use of nuclear weapons and even on the first use of nuclear weapons. This was precisely the spirit of the speech made the other day to a congressional committee by U.S. General Rogers. NATO's Supreme Commander. Nevertheless, I think THE NEW YORK TIMES report is noteworthy for two reasons. First, the report makes it quite clear that the use of nuclear weapons is advocated not only by the Pentagon's military chiefs but also by civilian leaders, as the paper stresses. In other words, the reliance placed on nuclear weapons is not the result of the military's narrow-mindedness but an integral part of US foreign policy, drafted and being implemented by the present Washington administration. As it happens, this is admitted by Senator Hart who notes that President Reagan's ideas are based on the possibility of waging a nuclear war and winning it.

The second cause for concern is the fact that these misanthropic ideas are not being hushed up. On the contracy, Washington is talking about them for all to hear. And they are being set out in publications with print runs of millions of copies, and not only in THE NEW YORK TIMES.

It is not possible to miss the obvious intention behind all this. The aim is to accustom Americans and other peoples to the very idea of the admissibility, the possibility, of nuclear war. In short, a quite definite propaganda campaign in favor of such a war is in progress. It is not difficult to guess in whose interests this is being done. Above all, it is being done in the interests of the United States' atomic monopolies, which are making huge profits out of the production of nuclear weapons. As it happens, this is not being concealed by the U.S. press itself, which admits -- as the magazine COMMON CAUSE did recently -- that the large military corporations are spending considerable sums of money on advertising their products. Later on they submit claims to the Pentagon for reimbursement of these expenses.

These facts again show the relevance of the proposal made by Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko. He proposed that all the nuclear powers should establish certain principles governing relations with each other, including the renunciation of propaganda in favor of nuclear war in all its forms, global or limited. I remind you that in our country all propaganda in favor of war is absolutely forbidden by the constitution. If other nuclear powers were to follow this example, this would be a serious factor in the prevention of a nuclear catstrophe.

U.S. SUBMARINE 'ESPIONAGE' ACTIVITIES PUBLICIZED

LD221747 Moscow TASS in English 1633 GMT 22 Mar 84

[Text] Moscow March 22 TASS -- TASS news analyst Vasiliy Kharkov writes:

The American television company ABC has transmitted on Wednesday night a report of its correspondent at the Pentagon in which it is said that U.S. submarines invariably penetrate into territorial waters of other states, and collect there intelligence information. Such secret operations, it is noted in the report, are conducted also against states which are considered to be friendly to the United States.

The ABC correspondent adds that deliberate violations of other countries' territorial waters are committed by both nuclear submarines and special miniboats which frequently act under the guise of research ships.

It has long been known that the Pentagon is engaged in intensive military intelligence, in other words espionage with regard to other states. Though such operations are top secret, sooner or later they become known to the public.

The report of the ABC television company supplements the picture of Washington's unceremonious violation of sovereignty of other countries, encroachment on their security, flouting of basic principles of international law and morale. This is the policy of state terrorism in action.

Territorial waters are known to be an inalienable part of the territory of the coastal state and deliberate violation of territorial integrity of the state. By sending its submarines to other countries' territorial waters for espionage, the Pentagon not just tramples under foot the relevant international convention which was signed and ratified by the United States itself. It encroaches on security of other states, and creates a grave nuclear threat, since, according to the ABC television company, there are submarine carriers of nuclear weapons among intruders into territorial waters.

Washington and its NATO allies repeatedly kindled unseemly hullabaloo around some "mysterious" submarines appearing off the shores of Sweden and Norway. They hinted in no uncertain terms to "designs of Moscow." The Soviet Union officially turned down those fabrications, stressing that no Soviet submarine ever deliberately violated other country's water frontiers. Now that there is fresh confirmation of intrusions of American submarines into other countries' territorial waters, it is opportune to ask: "Hasn't the Pentagon's hand fumbled in Swedish waters?" and haven't, apart from purely espionage aims, political aims been also pursued, namely, to poison Sweden's relations with its great neighbour, to push it off from the course of neutrality and goad it into closer relations with NATO?

The Soviet Union put forward a whole package of initiatives bound to contain the aggravation of military confrontation in the high seas, considering those initiatives as a component part of the efforts aimed at relaxation of international tension. But Washington, however, conducts an opposite course.

ECONOMIC 'BURDEN' OF U.S. ARMS SPENDING CITED

PM130841 [Editorial Report] Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian on 6 March in its Morning Edition carries on page 5 a 1,200-word own correspondent L. Koryavin Washington dispatch entitled "Delayed Action Mine." The article, under the rubric "America As It Is," cites U.S. opinion to show that America's defense spending is a "heavy burden on the economy" and the "population," and that the current budget deficit incurred to meet this spending is "undermining the chances for a stable U.S. economic recovery in 1985 and subsequent years." Quoting a report by the director of the Congress' Bureau of the Budget calling for Congress to "decide for itself what 'proportion of the total national product to allocate to defense.'" Koryavin concludes:

"Many people in the United States are expressing a similar opinion. People here are increasingly talking about the 'antinational basis' of U.S. policy. The arms race that is being implemented by the present administration and its adventurist actions overseas are undermining the state's economic positions while failing to guarantee the security of the United States itself.

"This is why more and more Americans are expressing conern at the administration's political course and advocating that the military programs be limited and the dangerous 'delayed action mines' disarmed.

ADMIRAL COMPARES STRENGTH OF U.S., USSR NAVIES

PM211250 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English 18 Mar 84 p 5

[Admiral Nikolay Amelko article: "The Soviet Navy: To Defend or Attack?"]

[Text] As far back as the last century the American military theoretician Mahan came up with a concept, the essence of which boiled down to whoever dominates the sea, rules the world.

There are quite a few people in the present-day US higher military bodies who are supporting this concept. One such person is the head of the Pentagon, Caspar Weinberger, who said in one of his speeches that the US Navy "should and will dominate the sea until the beginning of the next century."

Material provision for this concept is presented by the US Navy numbering more than 500 warships of the main classes. They include 40 nuclear-powered submarines equipped with ballistic missiles, 90 multipurpose nuclear-powered submarines, 14 multipurpose aircraft carriers (including 4 nuclear-powered carriers), 30 cruisers carrying nuclear weapons, about 200 destroyers and frigates, 67 large landing vessels, etc. But even this huge arsenal of naval armaments no longer satisfies the Pentagon strategists. This is shown by the continuing growth in the rate of the quantitative buildup and qualitative development of the US Navy. By the end of the present decade the Pentagon is planning to increase its Navy by no less than 100 ships to bring their total number to 600.

The Soviet Union naturally could not passively watch the military preparations of the imperialist states. Conscious of a growing threat of attack, the USSR had to take a number of steps to strengthen its Armed Forces, including its Navy which is capable of rebuffing the aggressor in the case of war.

The logical result of these efforts is seen in the Soviet Navy acquiring modern submarines, surface ships and planes equipped with the latest weapons and radioelectronic systems. The Soviet ships are capable of making long-lasting voyages and tackling at sea the tasks to which they are assigned. But does this now mean that the Soviet Navy's role has undergone a basic change, that once it has become an oceangoing navy, it has lost its defensive nature? Soviet military doctrine has always been and remains one of a strictly defensive nature, based on using military force only as a means of defence.

It is understandable that, to answer this question, a comparative evaluation of the tactical and technical characteristics of the Soviet and American ships is not sufficient. Improving and developing the Soviet Navy is a logical countermeasure, brought on by the expansion and buildup of the US Navy's combat ability by the striving of the US leadership to provide beforehand a strategic advantage in case blows are delivered on the Soviet Union from the sea.

An important role has been given, for example, in the US nuclear forward-based systems to carrier-based aviation. The planes of the US multipurpose aircraft carriers, which are in fact floating airfields, are capable of delivering blows considerably deep inside the Soviet Union.

No less than two to four aircraft carriers with up to 160 planes carrying nuclear weapons are permanently stationed in the East Mediterranean and the West Pacific, that is in areas from where targets in the Soviet Union and other socialist community countries can be hit. These planes enable the aircraft carriers to stay at a distance of up to 2,000 km from the potential targets. If the other side had only had "coastwise" ships in its naval force, it would hardly be able to rely on efficient counteraction to the US aircraft-carrier forces.

The USSR's manufacture of ships, submarines and planes with nuclear weapons capable of hitting aircraft carriers efficiently before the latter's aircraft, in particular its attack planes armed with nuclear weapons, strike, is a logical response to the development and perfection of the American aircraft carriers.

The American nuclear-powered submarines which started combat patrol in the late 1950's are kept permanently ready to deliver a nuclear blow on the Soviet Union. The response to this threat was the building of anti-submarine aviation, anti-submarine ships and nuclear-powered hunter-killer submarines designed to fight US submarines in their combat patrol areas. Another response action was also provided in the 1960's by the Soviet Navy acquiring ballistic-missile submarines.

In finding an example of the allegedly "aggressive" role of the Soviet Navy. NATO propaganda quotes the fact that the Soviet ships "would probably operate" along the Atlantic communication lines. One must note in connection with these claims that the USA and NATO do not mean passenger ships but the transport across the Atlantic of combat equipment and troop contingents intended for hostilities against the USSR and other socialist countries. The fact that this kind of transport is not a fantasy but a tangible reality is proved by the numerous manoeuvres held by the NATO Staff. The Western press has written to this effect on more than one occasion. It is understandable that the Soviet Union has to take account of this. At the same time, it must be stressed once again that in this case, too, the actions of the Soviet Navy will be of a strictly defensive nature. They will be aimed at frustrating the USA's aggressive aspirations in Europe.

It is not easy to compare objectively the correlation of forces of two navies which have differences of principle in their structures and in the tasks with which they are entrusted. At the same time, there is a series of indices which can be proved with complete truthfulness. Let us look at some of them.

More often than not one can find in NATO information publications the assertions that the submarine fleet of the Warsaw Treaty countries numerically exceeds the NATO countries' submarine fleet. On the other hand, the NATO countries have sixteen aircraft carriers, while the Soviet Union has none. The scenarios of the numerous NATO naval manoeuvres, the operational goals and the tasks that they carry out during these manoeuvres help evaluate the damage they can inflict on the USSR economy, troop groupings and naval forces. Let us put our question in the following perspective: What advantage and in which of the armed forces should the Soviet Union have in order to neutralize this threat? In this perspective, the Soviet advantage in submarines should be viewed as a component of the force which prevents the West possibly using its aircraft carriers.

One criterion in evaluating the offensive capabilities of any navy is provided by the level of development of its amphibious landing force. According to data quoted by NATO sources, the joint number of amphibious landing forces of the North Atlantic bloc countries accounts for more than two hundred ships, including nine landing helicopter carriers and five all-purpose landing ships. The navies of the Warsaw Treaty countries number only about 100 vessels designed for landing operations.

A somewhat different criterion in comparing these forces' capabilities seems even more important in this case, and that is their troop capacities. In other words, the number of troops and armaments which they are capable of taking on board at one time and transferring to the landing area.

Experts have calculated that the NATO countries' amphibious force can lift at any one time 90,000 personnel and as many as 2,000 pieces of combat equipment, thus actually landing two large operational and operational-strategic contingents, each containing up to one expeditionary division of marines. If account is taken of the fact that the main part of NATO's landing force is stationed in areas of the bloc's advanced naval bases, it will be easily understood that they pose a real threat to the USSR.

The landing ships of the Warsaw Treaty countries have a considerably smaller displacement and a limited operational range. Their capacity to lift personnel and equipment is one-tenth that of NATO's landing force. They are capable of achieving tasks of a limited tactical scale and they cannot and are not designed to carry a landing force to remote areas, let alone the American continent.

The NATO countries' advantage looks even more considerable in terms of marines. In the USA alone the marine corps number about 200,000 men. It is clear that this force is far from being designed to defend the U.S. coast.

A lot of books, booklets and articles have been published in the USA, Great Britain and other NATO countries in which it has been attempted to prove that the United States is a seafaring power because, they argue, that nation is located on a "continental island" and that the Soviet Union "has no right" to have a large navy since it is a continental state.

Meanwhile, more than 40,000 out of the 60,000 kilometres of the Soviet borders look out onto the sea. Their length exceeds the length of the British coastline almost five times, and is more than twice the length of the U.S. Atlantic and Pacific coasts put together.

Quite often one comes across in the Western military press lamentations over the fact that "the Soviet naval flag is permanently present" in those areas of the world ocean which were always considered to be NATO's domain. One should remember that the US Navy has advanced groupings which are stationed permanently thousands of miles away from the American coast. They are the 6th and 7th operational fleets which patrol the Mediterranean and the west Pacific. These naval groupings contain predominantly the shock forces destined to strike targets in other countries, including the socialist community, to land marines and support their actions on land.

To monitor these forces, the Soviet Navy has set up groups of warships and service forces, both limited in numbers which stay permanently in the areas where the US naval strike forces are deployed. These are the Soviet countermeasures which were necessitated by the growing threat to its security. The quantitative and qualitative evaluation of the balance of forces of the American and Soviet fleets in the Mediterranean for example, gives an idea of their goals. The 6th Fleet has 25 to 30 ships, including two aircraft carriers with 80 attack aircraft carrying nuclear weapons (not taking into account the above-mentioned nuclear-powered submarine missile carriers).

The Soviet force, which is numerically half the size, has mainly antisubmarine warfare ships, as well as destroyers, cruisers and other ships. Comparing these forces, even without considering the other NATO countries' Mediterranean fleets, enables us to make an objective judgement as to who thinks in terms of an offensive and who thinks in terms of defence at this most important theatre of naval operations.

A considerably important place in carrying out the US aggressive plans is given to the 7th Fleet which has become the main force in the west Pacific. I must remind you that it was the 7th Fleet that took part in the aggression in Korea in 1950-1953 and in Indochina in 1964-1974.

The combat strength of the 7th Fleet has fluctuated within quite a considerable range depending on the situation. At times it has reached as many as 140 vessels. At the time of the most active hostilities in Indochina the fleet had 6 aircraft carriers, as against two during normal operational conditions. This shows the US ability to carry out rapid increases of force in the west Pacific, thus enhancing considerably its offensive capabilities.

At the turn of the 1980's the Pentagon started actively "developing" the Indian Ocean. An operational force has been deployed there since 1980, includng one to two aircraft carriers, up to 25 other large U.S. warships, an amphibious force and up to 17 transport ships with enough military equipment for combat operations of an expeditionary marine brigade lasting 30 days. The Diego Garcia Island has been turned into a large naval and air base, capable of catering for strategic aviation, aircraft carriers and missile submarines.

The logical end of the US penetration in the Middle and Near East, in the Indian Ocean basin, is seen in establishing the central command which has at its disposal troops numbering up to 230,000 men, incuding the so-called Rapid Deployment Force.

The USA is clearly opening a new southern strategic direction against the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. As a countermeasure to this escalation of the military presence the Soviet Navy has started to survey this group. This naval force is capable of neutralizing the US Navy in this region. We should note here that unlike the US force, the Soviet naval group in this region has no force designed to attack the coast. This is one more vivid example of the purely defensive functions of the Soviet Navy.

The Soviet Union has more than once addressed the United States suggesting that the Talks, interrupted in 1977 by the Americans, on reducing the two powers' naval activity, to be followed by a complete demilitarization of the Indian Ocean, be resumed. Such a solution of the problem would meet the basic interests of the people of all the littoral states in this wide area. But these Soviet proposals continue to remain unanswered.

The Soviet Union also supports the position of the non-aligned states in turning the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace and favours a speedy convocation for this purpose of an international conference under the aegis of the UN.

Taking account of the navies' enhanced role in the balance of the armed forces, the Soviet Union has proposed during the last few years a number of initiatives aimed at reducing the level of confrontation at sea. They include the proposals on limiting the missile submarines' patrolling lines, extending confidence-building measures to the sea and ocean areas, particularly to the regions crossed by the busiest sea routes, suggestions on withdrawing from the Mediterranean ships carrying nuclear weapons, etc.

Instead of giving a constructive answer to these proposals, the USA and other NATO countries have started implementing new programmes of increasing their naval forces. The resolution "Curbing the naval arms race: limitation and reduction of naval armaments, extension of confidence-building measures to seas and oceans" was adopted at the 38th Session of the UN General Assembly by 73 states, including the USSR. Nineteen countries voted against, including the USA, Great Britain, West Germany, Italy, Japan and Israel.

This fact confirms the dangerous political line of these powers. "Trident", the new strategic US nuclear-missile submarine-based system, is being built very rapidly. According to the programme, 20 "Ohio"-type submarines are to be built (five of them have already been completed), equipped in the future with Trident-II missiles which will have a higher firing precision, and 8 warheads, each of which will carry an equivalent of 500 kilotons of TNT. The designed missile range will be 11 to 12 thousand kilometres. In addition, new powerful nuclear-powered aircraft carriers are being built, and so are many multipurpose nuclear-powered submarines and missile cruisers. Programmes are being implemented to modernize ships and to equip them with "Tomahawk" cruise missiles with a firing range of 2,600 km.

Under the circumstances the Soviet Union also has to take correspondent countermeasures. As the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee K.U. Chernenko said recently: "We shall go on taking steps to strengthen our country's defence so that we have sufficient means to cool the burning heads of some warmongering adverturers." This is why the Soviet Armed Forces, including the Soviet Navy, maintain at a high level their readiness for an immediate repulsion of any aggression under any conditions. In the final analysis this is not only a right, but also an obligation of any sovereign state.

U.S. LEAFLET ON SOVIET PROPAGANDA CHALLENGED

PM150925 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 14 Mar 84 p 14

[Commentary by political observer Fedor Burlatskiy under the rubric "International Life": "West Europe: Seduced and Deceived"]

[Text] There is a substantial difference between West European and U.S. attitudes toward nuclear war. Europe cannot want such a war. The reason is obvious. In the event of a nuclear war, Europe would be wiped off the face of the planet as if a comet had swept through it. This is known not only by scientists and military experts but even by the most shortsighted politicians. And although one part of West Europe is speaking about this at the top of its voice at antinuclear rallies, marches, and demonstrations, the other part, representing its elite, keeps this distasteful truth under wraps.

Matters are different in the United States. Many military experts and leading politicians there still find some glimmer of hope in the event of nuclear conflict. Some are calculating on localizing it somewhere in Europe or elsewhere in the world, others are hoping to be among the lucky ones who would somehow manage to "sit out" the nuclear war somewhere -- in a deep underground bunker, in some far-away outlying district, or even high up in the air, either in an aircraft or in a spaceship.

The Americans have actually come up with the idea of shifting the center of gravity of nuclear confrontation from United States and the USSR to the USSR and West Europe. This was the secret scheme they had in mind when, in December 1979, they imposed on NATO the "arms upgrading" resolution, misleading their allies as regards their readiness to conduct constructive talks with the USSR on the reduction of nuclear weapons in Europe.

They treated West Europe the same way a seduced woman is usually treated. To start with she is indulged, then she is reassured, and finally she is shamelessly deceived.

It seems to me that these were the feelings which prompted the publication of the leaflet "The Soviet Propaganda Campaign Against NATO" by the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency in October 1983. The leaflet's subtitle says that its special purpose is to reply to the Soviet propaganda campaign against NATO's December session decision to "modernize" (!), in other words, according to the parenthetical explanation, to install Pershing II and cruise missiles in West Europe.

The leaflet's author has structured it, so to speak, in dialogue form -- citing our Soviet arguments and immediately giving the American reply. Quotations from statements by Soviet political and military leaders on the hand, and comments by the U.S. agency on the other. Very well, let us also adopt the same format. Let us listen to the leaflet's author, the Agency agent, so to speak (these passages are quoted verbatim) and, in our turn, comment on his arguments. Here goes....

Agent: The Soviet propaganda topic which is possibly the most effective -- at any rate among some states of West European public -- and simultaneously exerts the most destructive influence on NATO unity consists in the Soviet Union's claim that the United States planned to, and did, deploy cruise missiles and Pershing II's with a view to implementing the strategy of keeping nuclear war within Europe's borders (in other words, "Europeanizing" a nuclear conflict while U.S. territory remains unharmed). The truth is the complete opposite. The basic element in a sensible explanation of the NATO decision to approve the deployment of ground-based medium-range nuclear missiles is the need to dispel Soviet illusions concerning the tempting possibility of heading a nuclear conflict theater in Europe without running any particular risk of Soviet territory being attacked.

Commentator: I am very grateful to you, Mr Agent, primarily for your frankness. This really is the main purpose of the leaflet. This immediately brings into the open, for everyone to see, the prominent ears of the thermonuclear donkey you are driving.

Right at the very beginning the brochure lets out that which was the innermost secret of Pentagon strategists -- the localization of nuclear conflict within Europe. The secret hope that the Pershing II cruise, and SS-20 missiles would flatten out both sides of the European Continent to such an extent that the only thing left for the Americans to do would be either to wash their hands like Pontius Pilate or to finish off the job with the help of strategic missiles, submarines, or the numerous bases surrounding the Soviet Union.

I would like to draw the attention of West Europe's representatives to the very end of the above-quoted sentence: "without running any particular risk of Soviet territory being attacked." How come? Why "without risk?" If a nuclear conflict really erupted in Europe, what would the strategic installations on the American Continent and on U.S. submarines and aircraft be doing? What is there to stop them going into action?

Agent: The situation was changed in the seventies by two decisive factors: the Soviets' attainment of strategic parity with the United States and the deployment of SS-20 missiles.

The INF (medium-range -- F.B.) class of missiles like the SS-20, Pershing-II, and cruise missiles is an arms category that is very important both for NATO and the Soviet Union. The importance of this is emphasized by the fact that the United States and its NATO allies are arguing that discussion at the Geneva arms control talks should center primarily on these missiles, and only afterwards on aircraft, and that premature attempts to limit the latter could complicate the talks.

The Soviet claim that "balance in medium-range weapons" already exists in Europe is based on an incorrect and selective use of initial data. In actual fact, the Soviet Union maintains superiority in every category of medium-range systems. The Soviets include in their "balance" the independent British and French strategic systems and some U.S. aircraft which are not stationed in Europe.

Commentator: Before I start on the calculations for these barbaric games, of which ordinary readers on all continents are thoroughly tired, I would like to draw attention to two or three points in my opponent's reasoning which are nothing but totally empty yawning gaps of logic or, as the U.S. strategists delight in saying nowadays, "windows of vulnerability."

First window. The agent's arithmetic makes use of data (which are, by the way, selected on a biased basis) referring to 1983 to provide an inconspicuous, but far from insignificant misinterpretation. You see, the NATO session decision was taken 4 years earlier, in 1979. That was when the NATO politicians were faced with the choice of either beginning "arms upgrading" or starting talks with the USSR on the limitation of medium-range weapons in Europe. They opted for "arms upgrading," but at that time there was not a single Western politician, just as there was not a single halfway serious military expert, who even tried to argue that the Soviet Union enjoys superiority either at the strategic level or in the European region.

I would mention, by the way, that a few days ago, the U.S. Defense Department announced in its annual report to Congress that last year the United States "caught up with the USSR in terms of the technical standards of most strategic nuclear arms and has overtaken it is some other military equipment fields...as regards the strategic missiles that have already been deployed, approximate parity exists between the two superpowers."

You don't have to be a prophet to foresee that before too long, the United States will also admit the existence of approximate parity in the nuclear arms delivery vehicles in Europe, just as it admitted it a few years ago.

And now for the second window of vulnerability -- the idea of counting only missiles, and only afterwards...afterwards, the aircraft. This approach by our quiet American brings to mind the old prison joke about one inmate saying to another: "Let's share your rations first, and then we will each eat our own."

The reason why the Americans want to count only ground-based missiles is absurdly simple: They have more aircraft and other nuclear weapon delivery vehicles stationed in the European region. But then why try to pull the wool over people's eyes? What difference does it make what vehicles will be used to deliver and drop the nuclear mushrooms over East European countries and the USSR, be they ground-based missiles, land-based aircraft, carriers, or submarines stationed in European waters? We have more missiles than NATO in Europe, and we openly admit this. But NATO has more of the other delivery vehicles, and its agents unscrupulously deny this. It seems absurd to talk about one while ignoring the other. This is so obvious that there is no point in even trying to explain it.

And, finally, the third window of vulnerability -- the "independent" British and French strategic systems. These "independent" nuclei [yadra] can only fly in one direction -- to the East. The U.S. spokesmen are unlikely to start arguing that the French and British missiles are targeted on the West, on the United States.

Here, for example, is what the newspaper LE MONDE DIPLOMATIQUE (January 1984) wrote in connection with determining the position of French and British nuclear arms at the Geneva talks on the reduction of nuclear arms. It refers to a study recently completed by U.S. experts for the U.S. Congress. This study consistently criticized all the Western countries' provisions on this issue. The newspaper presents these critical remarks with brief explanations of the Soviet position, which the authors consider to be largely justified.

And now let us tackle the calculations of the European balance of forces. I have before me data from an authoritative Soviet source, the leaflet "Disarmament: Who Is Against?", published by the Military Literature Publishing House in 1983. The Soviet delivery vehicles targeted on Europe have 2,153 nuclear warheads. The NATO delivery vehicles have 3,056 nuclear charges; in other words, almost 1,000 units more than the USSR.

Thus the decision by NATO's December 1979 session was not linked to an alleged Soviet superiority. It pursued different goals. What these goals are we will see right away when the quiet American agent comments on the most important question of the Soviet Union's unilateral pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons.

Agent: For a long time the Soviets showed preference for this idea, seeing it as an opportunity to prove themselves "morally superior" to NATO. As part of its strategy of deterrence, NATO kept open its option to be the first to use nuclear weapons, but only in response to a mass attack mounted with conventional weapons by the Soviet Union -- a "Blitzkrieg" against NATO. (The Soviet doctrine rigorously emphasizes that such an attack must be accompanied by nuclear strikes against NATO targets). The concept of a preventive nuclear strike is in line with long-established principles of Soviet military doctrine, which attaches decisive significance to achieving surprise, gaining the initiative, and creating maximum opportunities to limit casualties among the Soviet Armed Forces and the civilian population.

Commentator: Why would it be bad and who would suffer if all nuclear powers, following the Soviet Union's example, were to pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons? If there is no first strike, there will be no retaliatory strike. Therefore, there would be no nuclear war.

Nevertheless, it appears that NATO has its reasons for wanting to retain "the option to be the first to use nuclear weapons" in its arsenal. Let us examine these reasons.

First reason. A NATO nuclear strike is possible in the event of a "Blitzkrieg" by the USSR's conventional Armed Forces. Here we have again the tiresome myth of the occupation of West Europe by the Soviet Union. "The Russian tanks are coming!" -- this has become a nightmare for weak-kneed U.S. politicians and old-fashioned Hollywood producers. This was the slogan beneath which NATO was created way back in the past. Mouthing this slogan, the United States started to unleash the arms race. As we can see, it is still manipulating this hackneyed slogan even today.

But in the end, the Americans and all Natoites must ask themselves a simple question: Why have the Russian tanks not come to the West so far, although they have been expected (probably with fear) for more than 40 years now?

These tanks have not shifted from their positions even now that (if our opponent is to be believed) the USSR has at its disposal a "colossal nuclear missile advantage" in Europe.

The second reason is the existence of the concept of a preventative nuclear strike in the USSR. But where can you see even a hint of a preventive strike doctrine? In which statements by our political and military leaders, in which (at the very least) leaflets or articles can they be found? The Soviet Union has unilaterally renounced the first nuclear strike. And the NATO agent insists: It is this that means that the USSR adheres to the concept of first nuclear strike. Well, what can you do with someone whose eyes, instead of the usual pupils, contain maliciously distorting lenses?

Agent: It must be noted: The Soviets, experts in making declarations, claim that the development or deployment of armaments which they are either planning or already implementing are in response to NATO and U.S. actions. This confusion of cause and effect pursues the Soviet goal of undermining public support for NATO's "two-track decision" aimed at maintaining its defense position.

Commentator: But everyone knows that the United States was the first to build and detonate the atom bomb, the first to build a strategic bomber and a submarine carrying nuclear weapons, the first to build a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier, the first to build a triple-warhead missile, the first to build a neutron bomb. We have always followed the nuclear leader, the United States. We may have caught up with the leader, but we have no intention of overtaking him. All our proposals are aimed at halting the race and starting, with joint efforts, to reduce the level of arms and, ultimately, to totally ban nuclear weapons. This goal is pursued by the SALT II treaty, which has not been ratified by the United States, by the proposals to freeze the nuclear arsenals, and by the numerous other specific proposals aimed at reducing strategic arms and medium-range nuclear means.

Agent: NATO's planned deployment of medium-range missiles is not a retreat from its preceding policy of deterrence. Deterrence as strategy is supported within NATO because it works. Nuclear deterrence and collective defense safeguard peace in Europe, which has gone through the grim trials of two world wars in this century -- and this is the basis of NATO's existence as the "real peace movement."

The NATO decision...was taken as a guarantee that the Soviet Union would never launch a war, in the knowledge that its own territory may find itself undefended against attack and with no hope that European security would ever be divorced from U.S. security. The NATO decision has stepped up deterrence and offered a firm response to Soviet propaganda.

Commentator: I will leave the sentence -- truly worthy of Tartuffe -- about NATO as the "real peace movement" between the agent and his conscience.

Nevertheless, this question deserves serious analysis. What in actual fact has been the role played by nuclear weapons in the fate of today's world? Must mankind worship them for safeguarding the world from the threat of a world war? Must mankind curse them for keeping humanity in a state of humiliating fear and constant expectation of a horrifying end? Must mankind erect a monument to Mr Truman, who dropped the bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and at the same time to all the U.S. presidents who have feverishly stockpiled these weapons.

I am deeply convinced that nuclear weapons have proved to be not man's salvation, but his tragedy. The reason World War III has not started is not because nuclear weapons exist, but because there exist political forces, including mighty states, as well as peoples in all countries capable of containing the nuclear aggressor.

But the matter does not end there. In John Kennedy's time, the then U.S. Defense Secretary Robert McNamara put forward the concept of "mutual assured destruction," which was subsequently named the doctrine of mutual deterrence. Today, 20 years later, the White House has started a de facto review of this doctrine. The U.S. stance of continuing the nuclear race and expanding it to new fields is constantly destroying the doctrine of deterrence. During the process of this race, the West may gain the illusion that it is stronger and can therefore run the risk of war. In addition, these nuclear weapons acquire new qualities in connection with the plans for preparing for the so-called "Star Wars." The attempt to create a "defense shield" by deploying laser and other weapons in space may at any time lead to a sharp destablization and consequently become the cause of a nuclear conflict.

Finally, the United States is now making efforts to separate U.S. security from European security. Everything points to the fact that the U.S. strategists are essentially renouncing the doctrine of deterrence. They are once more in pursuit of the shadow of military superiority.

Agent: The Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact countries, despite their exceedingly high-flown support for arms control, have recently put forward specific ideas for practical talks and for equitable and verifiable agreements on the main disputed questions. Instead, they prefer to offer tactical opposition to the West's efforts to create meaningful arms control frameworks, as well as to the West's specific proposals. On the medium-range missiles issue, the Soviets have been especially concerned with presenting an attractive impression of positive moves in the Soviet position in the Western mass news media. Nevertheless... the West must not enter into agreements with firm assurances of Soviet concessions.

Commentator: Essentially, this is all that our opponent has said on the question of the possibility of reaching agreement on medium-range weapons in Europe and, incidentally, on the arms limitation question as a whole. And this is no accident.

The ears of the above-mentioned nuclear donkey become immediately and especially visible here. In practical terms, the leaflet contains an analysis of neither the Soviet proposals at the Geneva talks on medium-range weapons nor of the U.S. position. And yet it is well known how matters began in December 1979. The decision taken at that time was called the "two-track" decision: NATO pledged to march along two tracks -- one toward the deployment of U.S. missiles in the continent and the other toward talks on the reduction of medium-range nuclear weapons. And what happened as a result? What did NATO achieve? What it achieved was that the deployment of U.S. missiles began in Europe against the European people's will. Another achievement was that, in response to this, the USSR lifted its moratorium on the deployment of SS-20 missiles and started to deploy them in Czechoslovakia and the GDR.

It is impossible to march along two tracks in politics if these tracks lead in different directions. It is impossible to simultaneously hatch plans for regional (European) nuclear war and to consolidate security in Europe. Finally, it is impossible to simultaneously build up nuclear arms and to think that this averts the danger of nuclear war. Comrade K.U. Chernenko said in his speech to the voters: "The curbing of the nuclear arms race has, of course, key significance for peace and the people's security. The USSR's position on this question is clear. We are against competition in building up nuclear arsenals. We have been and remain advocates of banning and destroying all types of such weapons."

In conclusion, I will attempt to give a general assessment of my opponent. I cannot fail to recall what was said by Niccolo Machiavelli, that brilliant political psychologist and adviser to statesmen. He said that advisers are of three kinds, the first of which understand everything by themselves; the second are able to assimilate the thoughts of others; and the third do not understand anything, be it by themselves or when others explain it to them. I fear greatly that my opponent belongs precisely to the third category and will understand nothing from what I have tried to explain to him in good faith. But perhaps the people who have ordered his leaflet will understand something. He has performed his task so flatly, so unconvincingly, and so unprofessionally and his feelings are so far removed from the true interests of peoples in the East and West in diminishing the nuclear threat that he really must be made to return in full the fee paid to him by his masters and they must forever reject his propaganda services.

PRC PREMIER SAYS 'WARM WELCOME' AWAITS REAGAN

LD221757 Moscow TASS in English 1650 GMT 22 Mar 84

[Text] Beijing March 22 TASS -- The newspaper RENMIN RIBAO carries a report of the XINHUA NEWS AGENCY about a meeting between Zhao Ziyang, premier of the State Council of the People's Republic of China, and Donald Regan, U.S. secretary of the Treasury, paying a visit to China. Zhao Ziyang told the U.S. Treasury secretary that the Chinese Government was attaching extreme importance to the visit of President Reagan to China scheduled for this April. The government and people of the republic will accord the U.S. President "a warm welcome and friendly reception." The premier expressed the hope that Reagan's visit would have a positive effect on the further development of mutual understanding and trust between China and the USA.

COMPARISON OF PRC BORDER NAVIGATION MEETING

Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian on 17 March carries in its Morning Edition on page 5 a TASS report on the USSR-PRC border river navigation meeting held in the Chinese town of Heihe on 15 March. The IZVESTIYA report, entitled "Protocol Signed," has been compared with the Moscow TASS International Service Russian version published in the 16 March Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, page B 1, revealing the following variation:

Paragraph one, line three reads in IZVESTIYA: ... of regulating shipping on rivers in border regions. A corresponding Soviet-Chinese ... (rewording, omitting river names)

BRIEFS

WORLD METEOROLOGISTS IN BEIJING -- Beijing March 21 TASS -- Scientists and experts in meteorology from the People's Republic of China, the USSR, Britain, the U.S. and a number of other countries have attended a session of the amalgamated scientific committee on the world program of the study of climate held in Hangzhou. Participants in the session discussed the results and prospects of the study of climate on the planet, the impact of man's activities on climate, the interrelation between the ocean and the atmosphere and the forecasting of climatic conditions. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1023 GMT 21 Mar 84 LD]

NAKASONE ARRIVES IN PRC FOR 'OFFICIAL VISIT'

LD231113 Moscow TASS in English 1015 GMT 23 Mar 84

[Text] Beijing March 23 TASS -- Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone of Japan arrived here today for a four-day official visit at the invitation of the Chinese Government. He is accompanied by Shintaro Abe, minister of foreign affairs.

JAPANESE DEPUTY FOREIGN MINISTER VISITS KIEV

AU221130 Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 18 Mar 84 p 3

[Excerpts] RATAU -- T. Nakajima, Japanese deputy minister of foreign affairs, visited Kiev recently, accompanied by a group of experts and M. Sakashima, Japanese ambassador to the USSR. On the Soviet side, the Japanese representatives were accompanied by N. N. Soloviev, Far East Department chief in the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs. T. Nakajima paid a visit to Yu. N. Kochubey, Ukrainian deputy minister of foreign affairs. The Ukrainian Ministry of Foreign Affairs gave a dinner in honor of the Japanese visitors. The guests visited the Ye. O. Paton Electric Welding Institute of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences. The representatives of Japan toured the city, saw its projects and architectural and historical mounments.

U.S. SOF'S OKINAWA DEPLOYMENT 'DANGER' TO ASIA

OW221438 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 21 Mar 84

[Dmitriyev commentary]

[Text] In a commentary entitled "Green Berets Reappear in Asia," Radio Moscow commentator Dmitriyev states:

"A woman with her abdomen cut open was exposed to scorching sun and left to die. Her husband was forced to dig one grave for her and another for himself and then was shot in the head. I was not the only eyewitness to this scene. All the villagers saw it. Later on, it was announced that her brother was a Vietnamese Communist." This was an account given by a former American soldier who witnessed the criminal act of the so-called Green Berets in Vietnam. During the infamous war started by the U.S. imperialists against the Vietnamese people, the U.S. Special Operation Force (SOF), known as Green Berets, displayed their brutality, particularly against civilians. In 1969 alone, some 18,000 peasants were killed merely because they sympathized with patriots.

They were forced to withdraw to their home country 10 years ago, but now they are going to reappear in Asia. A few days ago, Washington notified the Japanese that one battalion of the SOF would be deployed at Torii Station in Okinawa Prefecture. Though the first group will arrive this month, an advance party of six members of the SOF has already arrived at the base tc make preparations for the arrival of the battalion.

Some 40,000 American officers and men are stationed in Japan. It may seem that an additional 300 men will not impose any effect on the general situation. The Green Berets are special operation forces, and compared with other branches of the U.S. forces, hold a special place in the whole Army. The Green Berets are a group of high-level professionals who have mastered various ways to murder and scheme utilizing the Pentagon's latest technology.

In particular, the U.S. military authorities have high opinions of the Green Berets' capability in carrying out operations either individually or in small groups.

A representative of the Joint Chiefs of Staff recently disclosed to the U.S. Congress that the Green Berets are specially trained for limited warfare -- when large units cannot be appropriately mobilized -- or to repulse threats to U.S. interests. While the Green Berets were still active in Indochina, THE NEW YORK TIMES reported that their tasks included collecting prized intelligence, carrying out operations, abducting people, and liquidating undesirables in South Vietnam and neighboring countries. Judging from all this, it is quite obvious that the Green Berets also carry out terrorist actions against those independent states that pursue policies undesirable to Washington.

What happened in recent years clearly shows that the U.S. military authorities would resort to armed force without any reservations anywhere its national interests appear to be impaired. Most recently, the U.S. forces trampled upon the liberty of an independent state, Grenada, while shelling from the battleship New Jersey brought death and destruction to the Lebanese people. Such actions of the U.S. imperialists have aroused indignant protests all over the world.

In the eyes of Washington's strategies, the SOF has one so-called advantage -- its actions are not accompanied by the roar of shells nor exploding bombs. The illusion that the Green Berets can be secretly mobilized without the knowledge of world public opinion has naturally aroused the desire to once again deploy them in actions against the Asian people.

We have precedents for this. The Green Berets were once dispatched from Japan to defend the so-called U.S. interests in Indochina. The U.S. military authorities contended that the SOF units were assigned to combat terrorists. Those whom Washington called terrorists were people who supported the independence of newly-arising states. Incidentally, it is not imaginary terrorists, but actual terrorists, in Green Beret uniforms, that are instructing Salvadoran foragers in their terrorist warfare against their own people.

Terrorists, not imaginary but actual, are now making preparations to settle in Okinawa, thousands of kilometers from the United States. What is the purpose of this? The nature of the SOF itself denies the defensive purpose of this deployment, and Washington does not take any pains to conceal this fact. Japan is opening up its own territory for the deployment of units, obviously assigned the task of terrorist actions against the independent states of Asia. Does this truly conform to the interests of Japan's true security?

Many Japanese people immediately realize that the answer is in the negative. The intention of deploying American SOF units on Okinawa has already aroused opposition among the local people. Many people have expressed their apprehensions about the danger imposed not only to the Okinawan residents, but also to the security of the whole Far East by the deployment of the Green Berets. They are firmly determined to appeal to the prefectural authorities and the government to obstruct the Green Berets' deployment. Many people in Okinawa Prefecture have expressed their determination to prepare more concrete protests should their appeal be ignored.

'UNPRECEDENTED SCALE' OF 'TEAM SPIRIT-84' HIT

LD222047 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 22 Mar 84

[From the Vremya newscast; V. Solovyev commentary over introductory clips showing military maneuvers]

[Text] The U.S.-South Korean "Team Spirit-84" maneuvers are a new manifestation of U.S. aggressive policy in Asia. [clips of maneuvers, overlaid with name of commentator]

For a second month the South Korean peninsula is covered with the smoke of combat exercises. Here, under the command of Pentagon generals, U.S. and South Korean troops are rehearsing against a strike by DPRK forces. These exercises have already long been part of the system for the armies of the two countries. This year's exercises, "Team Spirit-84," again confirm that the White House is striving not for peace and the reunification of Korea, but for the spread of the Seoul puppets' power to the entire peninsula.

These maneuvers, as is stressed by the DPRK Government, maintain provocative tension in the region at an extremely dangerously high level. The Pentagon is using all its Pacific Ocean bases: From some, detachments of assault troops are sent to the exercises; from others, bombers crammed full of nuclear explosives head for the Korean peninsula. A special role in these maneuvers is ascribed to bases on the Japanese islands. American invasion forces -- known as the Rapid Deployment Force -- in the majority make the jump from these islands to Korean soil.

U.S. and South Korean soldiers are now undergoing the latest examination of their readiness for battle. These maneuvers are distinguished from previous ones by their unprecedented scale: Over 200,000 soldiers are taking part. In arranging it, Washington and Seoul, for the umpteenth time, are not keeping to their word: holding such military exercises is a most blatant violation of the Korean truce agreement, which they signed. The "Team Spirit-84" maneuvers will last until mid-April. The days of spring -- while the curtain of smoke hangs over the area of the exercises -- will be imbued with extreme tension for the Korean people.

USSR, MPR AMITY GROUPS SIGN COOPERATION PROTOCOL

PM221331 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Mar 84 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Friendship Is Indestructible"]

[Text] Ulaanbaatar, 19 Mar -- A protocol on cooperation between the Federation of Mongolian Organizations of Peace and Friendship and the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations With Foreign Countries and the two countries' friendship societies for 1984 was signed here today.

The document provides for the rendering of assistance in steering the unvarying course of the CPSU and MPRP toward developing and intensifying all-around ties between the USSR and Mongolia and indestructible Soviet-Mongolian friendship. It is planned to hold sociopolitical and mass cultural events aimed at extensively familiarizing the Mongolian and Soviet public with the decisions of the fraternal parties' recent congresses. An important role is assigned to the Soviet-Mongolian and Mongolian-Soviet Friendship Societies. They will continue the propaganda of the foreign policy activity of the CPSU and the MPRP and carry out a package of measures devoted to notable dates in the two peoples' lives.

These are the 67th anniversary of Great October, the 63d anniversary of the victory of the people's revolution in Mongolia, the 60th anniversary of the proclamation of the MPR, and the 45th anniversary of the victory at Halhqin Gol.

Provision is made for active participation by the fraternal countries' friendship organizations in the development and expansion of direct links between the MPR's provinces and cities and the autonomous republics, oblasts, okrugs, and cities of the USSR. This, the protocol notes, will help the mutual study of the Mongolian and Soviet peoples' experience of socialist and communist building.

MORE REPORTAGE ON USSR-DPRK TREATY ANNIVERSARY

Soviet Official Hails Event

SK180307 Moscow in Korean to Korea 1130 GMT 16 Mar 84

[Statement by (Putoin), "responsible functionary" of the Soviet State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations, on the 35th anniversary of the signing of the agreement on economic and cultural cooperation between the USSR and the DPRK -- time, place not given]

[Text] [Begin recording in Russian fading into Korean] Dear Korean friends: On this significant occasion of the 35th anniversary of the signing of the agreement on economic and cultural cooperation between the Soviet Union and the DPRK, I, in the name of all functionaries of the Soviet State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations, wish you health and success in your work.

As you know, this was the first international agreement the DPRK signed after the workers' state was established in Korea. This agreement was an important one of international trust for the DPRK. In addition, this agreement consolidated the fraternal cooperation between the peoples of the Soviet Union and Korea after the Japanese colonialists retreated. It also laid a firm foundation for the extensive development of economic, cultural, and other relations between our two countries on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletariat internationalism and mutual, fraternal assistance.

I would like to stress that such mutual cooperation in various domains of economic construction has enabled us to use material, financial, and manpower resources more efficiently, thus contributing to solving all the problems more rapidly and more successfully.

Thanks to the technical cooperation of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, the DPRK was able to create a firm industrial foundation in a short period of time. This is clearly shown by the DPRK's rehabilitation, rebuilding, or newly construction of with the participation of the Soviet Union, more than 60 large-size enterprises covering such basic domains of the national economy as the electric power industry, the metallurgical industry, the petroleum-chemical industry, the coal industry, the spinning industry, the machine tools industry, and railway transportation. Among such enterprises are the Pyongyang, Pukchang, and Unggi thermal power plants, [name indistinct], and Aoji Synthetic Ammonia Plant.

The proportions of products from the enterprises built with Soviet cooperation of the total national production are: About 63 percent of power; 38 percent of rolled ferrous metal products; 50 percent of garment products, and 42 percent of (?chemical) products.

More than 3,000 Soviet technicians and engineers have come to the DPRK to cooperate with their Korean friends in building major plants, installing, assembling, and operating facilities, and training national cadres. The Government of the DPRK has awarded the Republic's citations and medals to 850 Soviet technicians, highly praising the meritorious services of the Soviet envoys that contributed to socialist construction in Korea.

The Republic has been able to provide production bases for tractors, trucks, large ships, complicated instruments, and other industrial products based on Soviet technical data plans given to the appropriate organizations of the DPRK free of charge.

Now, I would like to say a few words about enterprises that are being built in the DPRK with Soviet cooperation.

Undoubtedly, when these enterprises begin operation, they will also play an important role in developing many domains of the national economy in socialist Korea. Equipment is currently being built, assembled, and organized in these plants.

On the other hand, facilities at the Pukchang Thermal Power Plant are still being assembled. Soviet technicians are assembling the products for the 16th and last generator together with their Korean friends. The total power output of the Pukchang Thermal Power Plant will be 1.6 million kilowatts when the generator's assembly is completed. This plant will then be one of the largest power plants in Asia.

Construction of the (Pyonsan) Bearing Plant has been completed. Adjustments on the automatic production line, which is capable of producing 200 kinds of large and small bearings, are now being done. Adjustments to facilities are also nearing completion at the Pukchang Aluminium Plant. The first production line began operation as early as October of last year and the second line will begin sometime in the first half of this year.

Foreign trade is of great significance in the economic cooperation between our two countries. As has been reported, one-third of the DPRK's total foreign trade is with the Soviet Union.

The USSR-DPRK protocol for the exchange of goods for 1984 was signed some time ago in Moscow. This protocol prescribes the supply of machines, facilities, raw material, and material to the DPRK by the USSR, as in the past. On the other hand, the DPRK will supply rolled ferrous metal products, nonferrous metal, cements, vegetables, fruits, and consumer goods to the Soviet Union. On the occasion of the 35th anniversary of the signing of the agreement on economic and cultural cooperation, the Soviet people firmly believe that the measures for the efficient promotion of mutual benefits between the USSR and the DPRK will be strengthened and developed in the future, too. [end recording]

Soviets 'Proud' of DPRK

SK190556 Moscow in Korean to Korea 0930 GMT 17 Mar 84

[Mikhaylov on the 35th anniversary of the signing of the economic and cultural cooperation agreement between the USSR and the DPRK]

[Text] Up until its national liberation, Korea, a country with a long history, had signed more than a few international agreements.

The essentials of these agreements -- most of them covering various political and economic aspects -- have been the same. All of these agreements, which infringed on the Korean people's national interests, only served the capitalist monopolists and colonialists who were plundering the country's rich resources and exploiting the people's labor.

The USSR-DPRK agreement signed on 17 March 1949, based on the principles of mutual equality, sovereignty, benefits, and support was the DPRK's first truly international agreement.

I would like to note that this Soviet-Korean agreement on economic and cultural cooperation was signed shortly after the DPRK had been proclaimed. At that time, the working people of the DPRK took their first step toward the socialist future.

It was a time when the terrible consequences of the past -- for nearly half a century the Japanese colonialists behaved like the master of Korea --were making themselves felt in almost all aspects. The Japanese Army, retreating in August 1945 after the Soviet Army had dealt it an annihilating blow, destroyed the entire economy of the northern half of Korea. As a result, the working people of the DPRK had to solve a great number of complicated problems to rehabilitate the country in the midst of ruins and ashes to restore normal life, and to begin peaceful and creative labor.

The people in North Korea were not alone, however. The great superiority of the new type of relations established between our two countries was the fact that they were based on the mutual willingness to help each other in times of trouble, to support each other in all aspects, and to cooperate with one another.

The experience of the past 35 years fully shows that the friendship and cooperation with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries have served as a rock-firm foundation that has enabled DPRK to overcome difficulties and to conviencingly advance on the road of building a new society.

The Soviet people cannot help feeling proud of the Korean friends' brilliant development when they realize that the same amount of products turned out in all of 1944 in North Korea are now being produced in 10 or less days.

The Republic's economic structure has basically changed. Thanks to technical cooperation from the Soviet Union, such modern industrial sectors as the machine tool, machine building, metallurgical, and the (name indistinct] industries have been established and are being successfully developed. Men of superior ability have been trained in the nation and an extensive network of middle and high schools, colleges, and other general schools has been established.

The northern half of Korea has achieved tremendous accomplishments in agricultural development, in the construction of irrigation systems, and in the mechanization of labor-intensive farming. The working people of the DPRK have also achieved great victories in science, culture, public health, and public welfare.

The exploits of the workers, peasants, people, and intellectuals of socialist Korea in all social sectors become particularly clear when they are compared with the situation in South Korea -- where the economy is in chaos, inflation is increasing, unemployment is on the rise, the prices of basic daily goods are increasing, and concern over subjugation to foreign capital is deepening.

All these are the bitter results of the antipopular policies that the Seoul regime enforces in order to please the U.S. imperialists.

The fruition of the cooperation between the Soviet Union and Korea is varied and effective. Thousands of Soviet technicians have worked on the new construction sites of the Republic hand in hand with Korean workers and engineers. For example, the more than 60 industrial enterprises and other plants that have either been repaired or built with the participation of Soviet technicians have become the core of the DPRK's national economy.

The Soviet Union is now helping the DPRK repair or construct several enterprises that will enable it to greatly increase its production capacity in electricity, steel, rolled steel, chemical fertilizer, coal, and mineral ores.

The continual increase in trade can be cited as an important indication of the characteristic economic ties between the Soviet Union and the DPRK. The trade volume has increased manyfold in recent years. Cooperation in science and technology is growing accordingly with each passing year. Also, the two countries have developed a good tradition of exchanging scholars and experts from varous fields to exchange advanced experiences and modern scientific and technological successes.

In the spirit of the plan for cooperation in economy and culture between the two countries, the cultural ties between the two countries are strengthening and developing with each passing year. In the cities of the DPRK Soviet writers, painters, musicians, actors, and spotsmen are kindly accepted, and many Korean art troupes, theater groups, and sportsmen of various descriptions visit the Soviet Union. The two countries also frequently hold successful exhibitions of various kinds, festivals, and film weeks on the life of the peoples of the Soviet Union and the DPRK.

Expressing deep sympathy for the Korean people's desire to live together as one family, the Soviet people invariably and strongly support the Korean people in their effort to achieve the independent and peaceful reunification of their country and truly wish their Korean friends new successes in the DPRK's socialist construction and in their struggle to achieve national reunification.

The spirit of friendship and cooperation that developed from the USSR-DPRK treaty signed in 1961, which was based on the agreement signed in 1949, still rules the relations between the USSR and the DPRK.

Pact 'Important Milestone'

SK191222 Moscow in Korean to Korea 1330 GMT 17 Mar 84

[Station commentator (Kiseskiy) article]

[Text] On 17 March, we greet the 35th anniversary of the signing of an agreement for economic and cultural cooperation between the Soviet Union and the DPRK. On 18 March, we will greet the 36th anniversary of the signing of the agreement for friendly cooperation and mutual assistance between the Soviet Union and Bulgaria. In this connection, station commentator (Kriseskiy) writes:

These events marked an important milestone in the history of the development of relations between the Soviet Union and Korea and between the Soviet Union and Bulgaria.

These documents, which fully represented the interests of the peoples concerned, laid a good legal foundation for equal and reciprocal cooperation.

The Soviet-Bulgaria agreement contributed to the comprehensive development of relations between the Soviet Union and Bulgaria. Contributing to solidifying friendship between the peoples of the two countries, these relations have continuously developed. Bulgaria, which was once a backward, primarily agricultural country, has developed into an industrial nation since the attainment of sovereignty. The Soviet Union has assisted Bulgaria in developing its industrial potential. The components of Soviet-Bulgarian economic cooperation are now producing nearly 80 percent of the total industrial goods.

There is a Korean proverb saying: Birds are powerful because of their wings, and man is powerful because of his friendship. The DPRK believes that the meaning of this proverb is fully illustrated in Soviet-Korean cooperation.

With Soviet aid, 60 large industrial enterprises have been built in the DPRK. These enterprises are the core of the modern national industry of the republic. With Soviet aid, new facilities are now under construction, and new plans for effective cooperation are now being put into practice.

Equality and friendly assistance are the unique characteristics of relations among socialist countries. This principle is being applied in the sector of foreign policy. For example, along with other countries of the socialist community, the Soviet Union and Bulgaria have advanced a constructive plan for safeguarding international security and curbing the arms race.

The Soviet Union understands well the complicated situation on the Korean peninsula. South Korea is actually occupied by the United States. The preservation of security in Asia chiefly depends on the solution of the Korean question. The Soviet Union supports the constructive proposal of the DPRK Government to provide conditions for holding a dialogue to effectively achieve the country's reunification and to end U.S. interference.

The Soviet Union attaches primary signficance to expanding and solidifying cooperation with all socialist countries. This is the basic line of the Soviet Union for enhancing the influence of socialist countries in the international arena. Success in the cause of preserving peace and preventing nuclear catastrophe largely depends on the efforts to greatly expand this influence and on the consistent and positive objectives of the socialist countries.

U.S. INVOLVEMENT IN AFGHANISTAN LAMBASTED

Reagan Remarks Protested

LD221923 Moscow TASS in English 1902 GMT 22 Mar 84

[Text] Kabul March 22 TASS -- A big demonstration was held here today in front of the building of the American Embassy in protest against U.S. President Reagan's instigatory statement. The slogans of the demonstrators were "Hands off Afghanistan", "Long live the revolutionary Afghan people", "Down with the Pakistani reactionaries", etc.

The speakers at a meeting held during the demonstration exposed American imperialism's aggressive policy. They stressed that the lying contentions about the supposed suppression of Islam in Afghanistan absolutely do not accord with reality.

The participants in the meeting adopted a resolution.

Also today the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan issued a statement concerning the U.S. President's remarks.

On March 21 of this year, the statement says, President Reagan made a new slanderous and instigatory statement in connection with the so-called "Afghanistan Day" which is annually observed on the American Administration's initiative with the aim of instigating a campaign of attacks on the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan.

But by such contentions the American President only demonstrated again that the aggressive imperialism of the United States is the main instigator and conductor of the undeclared war against Afghanistan and that international terrorism has now become a component part of Washington's state policy.

The DRA Foreign Ministry resolutely condemns President Reagan's statement and qualifies it as rude interference in the internal affairs of sovereign, independent, democratic and non-aligned Afghanistan, directed at aggravating the situation in the region and beyond it, the statement says in conclusion.

Mosque Bombing U.S. 'Crime'

LD230253 Moscow TASS in English 0155 GMT 23 Mar 84

[Text] Kabul March 22 TASS -- Another bloody crime was staged by the Afghan counter-revolution. A bomb was exploded in the mosque of the Kabul Polytechnical Institute during the evening prayer on Wednesday. Four people were killed, 21 others were wounded, 18 of them gravely. The crime was committed the day after President of the United States Reagan has proclaimed support for the Afghan counter-revolution. Speeches of participants in a mass meeting of protest held today in the mosque's territory were imbued with wrath and indignation against the actions of the bandits and their trans-oceanic patrons.

Among the speakers were high representatives of the Afghan clergy: Chairman of the main board for Islamic Affairs of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan Abdul Wali Hojjat, Chairman of the Supreme Council of Ulema and Clergy of Afghanistan Muhammad Sayyed Afghani, influential representatives of religious communities from Afghanistan's provinces.

The policy of killings and destruction cannot meet the interests of the believers. The crime committed in the mosque will boomerang on those who committed it, Abdul Wali Hojjat said. Prominent clergyman Muhammad Salem Elmi read out a statement of the Supreme Council of Ulema and clergy in connection with a new anti-people and anti-Islamic action of the counter-revolution. The statement points to the implication of the United States in the killing of believers in the Kabul mosque, to the fact that the Reagan administration bears the responsibility for death and destruction that are sown on Afghan soil by counter-revolutionary bandits. The document stresses that no intrigues of reaction and imperialism can compel the patriotic clergy of Afghanistan to withdraw support from its people, the state and the April Revolution.

Aid to 'Bandits' Mounting

LD221449 Moscow TASS in English 1522 GMT 22 Mar 84

[Text] Washington March 22 TASS -- The U.S. Administration is going to continue rendering direct assistance to the Afghan counterrevolutionaries, using for the purpose the territory of Pakistan. Specifically, the White House is examining the question of increasing military aid to the bandit groups on the territory of Pakistan and equipping them with modern armaments for the subsequent smuggling of these groups to Afghanistan with the aim to destabilise the situation in that country. Washington also studies possibilities of creating a special bureau of subversive broadcasting stations "Liberty" and "Free Europe" on the territory of Pakistan. In this connection the former adviser of the Department of State John Buckley who is now heading these broadcasting stations engaged in slanderous activities has been dispatched to Pakistan.

According to observers, these activities of the White House enjoy the support of the Pakistani President Ziaul Haq and other officials. Questions connected with the expansion of the subversive activities against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan from the territory of Pakistan and the waging from there of an undeclared war against Afghanistan by U.S. special services were subject of consultations on a high level between Pakistan and [word indistinct]. U.S. observers point out that all these steps show once again that the U.S. is going to expand the interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan, to hamper political settlement and to draw the Pakistani authorities even further into the subversive activities against the USSR and the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan.

USSR IMPACT ON DRA PRODUCTION, TRADE INCREASES

LD221709 Moscow World Service in English 1531 GMT 22 Mar 84

[Text] Fresh facts of the development of economic cooperation between the Soviet Union and Afghanistan have been released in Moscow. Last year, for example, about 70 percent of produce in the government sector of Afghanistan came from Soviet-built facilities. Dozens of facilities in industry, agriculture and other economies were built jointly. The Soviet side supplied equipment for them. The Soviet Union's share in the total volume of Afghan foreign trade has come close to 60 percent.

COMPARISON OF BABRAK KARMAL'S NEW YEAR MESSAGE

Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian on 21 March carries in its Second Edition on page 3 a TASS report on the radio speech by Babrak Karmal, chairman of the DRA Revolutionary Council, on the approaching Afghan new year. The KRASNAYA ZVEZDA report, entitled "Under the Sign of Revolutionary Transformation," has been compared with the Moscow TASS English version published in the 21 March Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, page D 1, revealing the following variations:

Paragraph one, line four reads in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA: ...occasion of the Afghan new year... (deleting "approaching");

Paragraph one, line six reads in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA: ...important revolutionary transformations. The work to ...(deleting "in the country");

Paragraph one, line ten reads in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA: ...Self-Defense Forces. The process went... (deleting "and tribal volunteers");

Paragraph one, line eleven reads in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA: ...of population around the April Revolution... (deleting "the goals and tasks of");

Paragraph two, line two reads in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA: ...the products of agriculture have grown due... (substituting "agriculture" for "field cropping and animal husbandry");

Paragraph two, line four reads in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA: ...of state power ensures the drawing... (deleting "and management");

Paragraph two, line eight reads in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA: ...with other countries. The DRA proposals for settling the situation around Afghanistan form the basis for talks on these questions.

Resolutely denouncing U.S. imperialism's aggressive expansionist policy, the Afghan leader said that the DRA stands with the forces of peace and progress headed by the Soviet Union. "We fully support the USSR's principled foreign policy course in the cause of defending peace and the people's security," he said. (supplying alternate KRASNAYA ZVEZDA final passage).

'HOPEFUL' RESULTS PRODUCED BY THACH TOUR

BK221455 Moscow in Indonesian to Indonesia 1330 GMT 21 Mar 84

[Station commentary: "Steps Leading to a Dialogue"]

[Text] The overseas tour of Vietnamese Foreign Minister Nguyen Co Thach has ended. The itinerary has taken him to Indonesia, Australia, and Bangkok, where he made a brief stopover. The results of his tour were closely watched in Southeast Asian countries.

During the discussions, the Vietnamese foreign minister touched on a number of pressing problems in the political situation in this region, and explained the significance of the three Indochinese countries' appeal concerning these problems. The discussions brought hopeful results although they did not completely remove existing differences of view. They helped enhance mutual understanding and helped to seek a meeting point on problems discussed. It is apparent that the common interest of all sides to turn Southeast Asia into a zone of peace and stability reflects the benefit of dialogue aimed at this objective.

An agreement was reached in Jakarta to continue consultations. Indonesian Foreign Minister Mokhtar Kusumaatmaja accepted his Vietnamese counterpart's invitation to pay a return visit to Hanoi. In a joint statement, both Nguyen Co Thach and Mokhtar Kusumaatmaja made it clear that relations among Southeast Asian countries should be based on principles of peaceful coexistence and noninterference in each other's internal affairs. Indeed, all steps leading to the establishment of good-neighborly relations have caused apparent dissatisfaction in the United States and in some pro-American ASEAN circles. They quickly alleged that the Vietnamese foreign minister was trying to sow seeds of discord among the ASEAN countries, and also accused the three Indochinese countries of conducting an irrelevant policy.

With incessant verbal approaches to counter Nguyen Co Thach's tour, they arranged for tours to ASEAN capitals by leaders of the so-called immigrant Khmer coalition, Sihanouk and Son Sann respectively. Indeed, by fulfilling the U.S. Government's desire, these leaders issued provocative statements in an effect to complicate relations between the Indochinese and ASEAN countries. They have persuaded the ASEAN members to give military assistance to the coalition or, more precisely, to the Pol Potists hiding under the coalition's banner. Such a trick clearly shows how external forces are using the so-called Kampuchean issue to sharpen tension in the region to exert pressure on ASEAN members. However, the efforts of Sihanouk and Son Sann did not bring about the results they had expected. It was publicly stated in Jakarta that Indonesia did not want to take part in military adventures against People's Kampuchea. Several days ago, Minister-State Secretary Sudharmono said that the Indonesian Government does not intend to provide military or financial assistance to the so-called Kampuchean Coalition Government. Consequently, the attitude toward the Pol Potists is clear enough.

By focusing on Son Sann's presence in Indonesia, the JAKARTA POST has made it clear that the Pol Posists are unacceptable practically anywhere in the world. The identical approach is taken by Australia. Australian Prime Minister Hawke recently expressed serious concern about their efforts to try to return the bloody Pol Pot regime to power. It seems obvious that despite negative outside aspects, the Southeast Asian situation as a whole is undergoing certain changes towards normalization. A clear example is the current relationship between Vietnam and Indonesia.

The INDONESIAN OBSERVER considers the relationship good and useful. It is reflected in goodwill visits between Jakarta and Hanoi. They contain the hope that these relations will be able to remove existing misunderstandings. According to observers, Vietnamese Foreign Minister Nguyen Co Thach's discussions with Indonesian leaders represent a step toward constructive dialogue aimed at settling existing problems and creating a real climate of good-neighborly regional cooperation necessary for the social, economic, and cultural development of all these countries. It has become increasingly clear that it is in the context of such dialogue that we should find a way out of the presence of the so-called Kampuchean issue.

Speaking at a news conference prior to Nguyen Co Thach's arrival in [as heard] Jakarta, Indonesian Foreign Minister Mokhtar Kusumaatmaja said: "We consider Vietnam a friend, not an enemy. The results of the visit have shown new and clear evidence of the correctness of this view."

INDONESIAN FOREIGN MINISTER SET TO VISIT USSR

LD221344 Moscow TASS in English 1307 GMT 22 Mar 84

[Text] Moscow March 22 TASS -- Mokhtar Kusumaatmaja, foreign minister of the Republic of Indonesia, will pay an official visit to the USSR early next April at the invitation of the Soviet Government.

GUAM 'MAJOR U.S. BASE' IN WESTERN PACIFIC

LD230930 Moscow TASS in English 0715 GMT 23 Mar 84

[Text] New York March 23 TASS -- The Pentagon's activities to "develop" the small non-selfgoverning territories scattered in the expanses of the Pacific, Atlantic and Indian Oceans are one of the main obstacles to their decolonisation.

This is convincingly evidenced by the example of Guam Island which has been converted by the United States into its major base in the western Pacific. In accordance with U.N. resolutions, the administering authority should prepare its dependent territories for self-government. But, as is shown by a "working document" on Guam issued here by the U.N. Secretariat, if the island is being prepared for something, it is being prepared for war.

Units of the Air Force, the Navy, land forces, the Coast Guard, National Guard and engineer troops of the USA are now stationed on the island. Guam is so full of the military that anyone arriving there may well gather the impression that he is in a zone of combat operations.

HOFFMANN VISITS KUBINKA, RIGA; AIDES HONORED

Visits Kubinka Air Base

PM221141 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 22 Mar 84 Second Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "Visit to Air Force Unit"]

[Text] On 21 March the GDR military delegation headed by Army General H. Hoffman, member of the SED Central Committee Politburo and GDR minister of national defense, visited an Air Force unit in Kubinka. The German comrades familiarized themselves with combat equipment. The delegation was met by Chief Marshal of Aviation P.S. Kutakhov, commander in chief of the Air Force and USSR deputy defense minister.

The guests from the GDR were accompanied by Marshal of the Soviet Union V.G. Kulikov, USSR first deputy defense minister and commander in chief of the Warsaw Pact states' Joint Armed Forces.

Meetings in Riga

PM231041 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 23 Mar 84 Second Edition p 1

[Unnamed "own correspondent" and KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent Lieutenant Colonel B. Karpov: "On a Tour of the Country"]

[Text] ["Own correspondent"] On 22 March the GDR military delegation headed by Army General H. Hoffmann, member of the SED Central Committee Politburo and GDR minister of national defense, which is in the Soviet Union on an official friendly visit at the Soviet Government's invitation, left Moscow for a tour of the country.

The GDR military delegation was seen off at the capital's Vnukovo Airport by Marshal of the Soviet Union D.F. Ustinov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister, Marshal of the Soviet Union N.V. Ogarkov, chief of the Armed Forces General Staff and USSR first deputy defense minister; Marshal of the Soviet Union S.L. Sokolov, USSR first deputy defense minister; Army General A.A. Yepishev, cheif of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate; Chief Marshal of Aviation P.S. Kutakhov and Admiral of the Fleet of the Soviet Union S.G. Gorshkov, USSR deputy defense ministers; and generals, admirals, and officers of the Soviet Armed Forces.

The delegation leaving Moscow included GDR Deputy Ministers of National Defense Colonel General H. Kessler, chief of the National People's Army Political Main Administration; Colonel General F. Streletz, chief of the National People's Army Main Staff; Colonel General H. Stechbarth, commander of the Ground Forces; Colonel General W. Reinhold, commander of the Air Force and Air Defense Command; and Admiral W. Ehm, commander of the People's Navy.

The GDR military delegation is accompanied on its tour of the country by Marshal of the Soviet Union V.G. Kulikov, USSR first deputy defense minister and commander in chief of the Warsaw Pact Joint Armed Forces.

[Lieutenant Colonel B. Karpov] The GDR military delegation headed by Army Gen H. Hoffmann, member of the SED Central Committee Politburo and GDR minister of national defense, arrived in Riga.

The GDR guests were met at Riga airport by P. Ya. Strautmanis, chairman of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; Yu. Ya. Ruben, chairman of the Latvian SSR Council of Ministers; Lieutenant General A.V. Betekhtin, commander of the Baltic Military District; Colonel General V.P. Novikov, member of the military council and chief of the political directorate of the district; and other Soviet generals and officers.

A meeting was held with the delegation at the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee. During the warm, friendly talk A.E. Voss, first secretary of the Central Committee, spoke of how the republic's working people are implementing the 26th CPSU congress decisions and fulfilling the instructions of the CPSU Central Committee February (1984) Plenum.

The German comrades visited warships of the twice Red Banner Baltic Fleet. Lt Gen A.V. Betekhtin, commander of the district, gave a dinner in honor of the guests from the GDR.

GDR Military Aides' Awards

PM221255 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 22 Mar 84 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Presentation of Awards"]

[Text] On 21 March in the Kremlin V.V. Kuznetsov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, presented the Order of Lenin to Army General H. Hoffmann, member of the SED Central Committee Politburo and GDR minister of national defense.

Orders of the Red Star were presented to Colonel Generals H. Kessler, F. Streletz, H. Stechbarth and W. Reingold, Admiral W. Ehm, and Major Generals H. Winkler, and (G. Oldenburg).

On behalf of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and Soviet Government, V.V. Kuznetsov warmly congratulated the recipients and wished them new successes in further developing fraternal relations between the CPSU and the SED and the USSR and the GDR and in consolidating the socialist community.

H. Hoffman expressed deep thanks to the Communist Party and Soviet Government on behalf of the award recipients. He stressed that these high awards obligate them to work still more fruitfully for the benefit of the fraternal friendship of the GDR and USSR peoples and for the consolidation of the combat cooperation between the GDR National People's Army and the USSR Armed Forces.

The award recipients were also congratulated by T.N. Menteshashvili, secretary of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

The award presentation ceremony' was attended by Marshal of the Soviet Union V.G. Kulikov, USSR first deputy defense minister and commander in chief of the Warsaw Pact Joint Armed Forces; Army General A.A. Yepishev, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate; Chief Marshal of Aviation P.S. Kutakhov, Admiral of the Fleet of the Soviet Union S.G. Gorshkov, and Army General I.N. Shkadov, USSR deputy defense ministers; Lieutenant General G.A. Borisov, chief of the USSR Defense Ministry External Relations Directorate, and E. Winkelmann, GDR ambassador to the USSR.

USSR TO SPEED GOODS DELIVERIES TO POLAND

LD221834 Warsaw Domestic Service in Polish 1800 GMT 22 Mar 84

[Text] The Soviet Union is to expedite the delivery of goods to Poland, including refrigerators, washing machines, and television sets. This is the outcome of talks held between Tadeusz Nestorowicz, foreign trade minister -- who is staying in Moscow in connection with the CEMA Foreign Trade Commission meeting -- and Nikolay Patolichev, the Soviet minister of foreign trade.

The Soviet Union will consider expediting the deliveries of Soviet goods to the Polish market in connection with this year's 40th anniversary of People's Poland, it was stated during the talks.

RUSAKOV RECEIVES CSSR'S STEFANJAK IN MOSCOW

PM221242 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Mar 84 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "In a Friendly Atmosphere"]

[Text] M. Stefanjak, candidate member of the CPCZ Central Committee and first deputy chief of the CPCZ Central Committee International Affairs Department, was in Moscow 18-20 March and had meetings and talks at CPSU Central Committee Departments on questions of the further development and deepening of fraternal cooperation between the CPSU and the CPCZ.

M. Stefanjak was received by K.V. Rusakov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. The talk was held in a warm, friendly atmosphere.

BRIEFS

HUNGARIAN MICROELECTRONICS PROTOCOL -- Budapest: A protocol has been signed here about the completion of construction with Soviet assistance of the first phase of a Hungarian microelectronics industry enterprise. Under Soviet license trial production of special integrated circuits for the radio-electronics industry will be set up this year at the enterprise, and in 1985 serial production of them will begin. The program of development of microelectronics, the basis of which is formed from the experience of Soviet specialists makes it possible to give new stimulus to the introduction of computers in the Hungarian economy. The state has allocated more than 3 billion forints for the implementation of this program. [Text] [Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0630 GMT 12 Mar 84 LD]

REAGAN REMARKS ON FRANCE; MITTERRAND VISIT

PM221139 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Mar 84 First Edition p 5

[Yuriy Zhukov "Rejoinder": "A Wolf's Appetite"]

[Text] The French and U.S. presidents will meet in Washington 22 March. They have quite a few things to talk about. "On some issues we understand one another perfectly, and on others not so well," French President F. Mitterrand remarked delicately in an interview with THE WASHINGTON POST, published 18 March.

It is well known that the question of the undeclared war waged by the United States against Nicaragua, and some other issues, figure among the problems on which the leaders of France and the United States understand one another, "not so well."

And it is obviously no accident that, on the very eve of the meeting with his French colleague, U.S. President R. Reagan deemed it expedient to "suggest" to him the positions which, in his view, France and the United States ought to share as a result of the forthcoming talks.

In his interview with AFP he voiced the opinion that his talks would make it possible to narrow the "insignificant (?) differences" between Paris and Washington "on the question of the Central American crisis."

"What we are witnessing in the south," R. Reagan declared with passion, "is a trial of strength being carried out by Cuba and the Soviet Union, and nothing more. Cuba, like a prowling wolf, keeps its greedy eyes on its peace-loving neighbors."

But is there anyone who is unaware that the wolf prowling around Nicaragua is howling with an American accent? And is there anyone who is unaware that this very same wolf is prowling not only in Central America but also in many other parts of the world, including Africa?

It is also well known that the present U.S. Administration would very much like its NATO allies, including France, to join the United States in its overseas adventures, seeing that precedents of sorts already exist.

Nor is it an accident that in the same interview R. Reagan praised France for the fact that it "took upon itself a leading role" in helping the Ndjamena regime. "The way the French Government responded is worthy of all praise," he declared condescendingly.

The truth cannot be denied: the French troops urgently transferred to Chad are already bogged down in the armed conflict between troops of U.S. puppet Hissein Habre and the armed forces of Goukouni Oueddei's Transitional Government of National Unity. By taking this step, Paris has obviously pleased the Pentagon which really has a wolf's appetite. But this is clearly not enough for R. Reagan. He would like the U.S. allies to continue pulling his chestnuts out of the fire every where in the world, including Latin America.

This is how the U.S. President's interview was understood in Paris.

"Reagan Demands That France Support Washington's Policy in Central America," ran the heading under which LE MATIN published his statement.

How will the forthcoming dialogue between the two presidents end in Washington? Let's wait and see. In the meantime, let us just cite the correct appraisal of R. Reagan's statement provided by L'HUMANITE: "After the invasion of Grenada, after the United States has established an almost total blockade of Nicaragua, Reagan obviously has failed to notice that he has gone too far in his eloquence."

ANTI-SOVIETISM SEEN IN NORWEGIAN PREMIER'S REMARKS

PM221054 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Mar 84 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent N. Ivanov "Rejoinder": "Habitual 'Buts'"]

[Text] Helsinki -- It has long been noticed that Norway's prime minister is unenthusiastic about the "nuclear-free north" plan. If he has to comment on it he prefers to be extremely brief...The idea of setting up a nuclear-free zone in the north of Europe is interesting, but... Or...It is clear to everyone that we must guard our region from nuclear weapons...K. Willoch usually goes no further than this in his comments. However, you can understand him. What is there to add to the statement made with soldierly directness by Pentagon chief C. Weinberger: The idea of a nuclear-free north does not fit the framework of NATO strategy.

And the other day the readers of the Swedish newspaper SVENSKA DAGBLADET found out that the Norwegian premier has been extremely skeptical about the idea from the very start. He was "disturbed" by the position of...the Soviet Union. The implementation of the idea of a nuclear-free north, he stated, corresponds above all to Soviet interests. It is true that our country has supported Finnish President U. Kekkonen's from the very start. The Soviet Government has repeatedly stated its readiness to respect the status of a nuclear-free zone. It proceeds on the basis that the creation of a nuclear-free zone in this region corresponds to the interests of peace and security both in northern Europe and on the continent as a whole.

However, K. Willoch, you see, thinks differently. It seems that the Soviet Union supports the nuclear-free zone idea with the single aim of splitting the North Atlantic bloc and dislodging Denmark and Norway from NATO's ranks, thereby smashing the balance that has emerged in this region. And that was said without any provisos and habitual "buts." In the event of the "nuclear-free zone becoming a fact, the USSR will have an undoubted advantage in conventional weapons," the Norwegian prime minister stated.

It is easy to surmise what will happen next. All waffle about the "Soviet military threat" starts and ends in the same way. One can only marvel that this time the subject for the anti-Soviet fabrications has been the idea of a nuclear-free zone.

Incidentally, it was in Stockholm, where Norway's prime minister confided his "doubts" about the plan for a nuclear-free zone, that A. Jorgensen, chairman of Denmark's Social Democratic Party, called for concrete steps to be taken in this direction. I recall that the majority of the population of Norway, Finland, Sweden, and Denmark favor a nuclear-free north. The topicality of this initiative was confirmed at the recent Copenhagen meeting of the Nordic countries' foreign ministers.

SWEDISH OFFICIAL ON 'STABLE' RELATIONS WITH USSR

PM221319 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Mar 84 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report "On the 60th Anniversary"]

[Text] Stockholm, 17 Mar -- A ceremonial public meeting devoted to the 60th anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the USSR and Sweden has been held in the Swedish capital.

B. Karlsson, roving ambassador at the Swedish Foreign Ministry, who addressed the meeting, noted that Soviet-Swedish relations have withstood the test of time and have deep traditions. Despite the difference in sociopolitical systems, they have developed steadily over the past 6 decades in the interests of the peoples of both countries. Pointing out Sweden's adherence to the policy of neutrality and its desire to make an active contribution to the cause of ensuring lasting peace and peoples' security, B. Karlsson emphasized that the Swedish Government has invariably favored maintaining relations with the USSR at a high level and will endeavor to ensure that they remain stable and friendly.

STUKALIN MEETS AUSTRIAN CP CHIEF IN VIENNA

PM221306 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Mar 84 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Meeting in Vienna"]

[Text] Vienna, 20 Mar -- F. Muhri, chairman of the Communist Party of Austria [KPOe] met today at the KPOe Central Committee with B.I. Stukalin, chief of the CPSU Central Committee Propaganda Section, who is visiting here. They exchanged views on questions of the struggle waged by both parties for the preservation of peace and for disarmament, relations between the CPSU and the KPOe, and the situation within the communist and workers movement.

The meeting, which took place in a warm and friendly atmosphere, was attended by E. Scharf, member of the KPOe Central Committee Politburo, and (G.) Steiner, member of the KPOe Central Committee.

HUSAYN REMARKS 'REAL SHOCK' TO WASHINGTON

PM221101 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Mar 84 First Edition p 5

[Pavel Demchenko "Commentator's Column": "Another Misfire"]

[Text] The series of press statements made in the past few days by King Husayn of Jordan has caused, according to THE WASHINGTON POST, a "real shock" in the U.S. capital. The U.S. State Department even convened a special press conference in this connection, and an "explanation" by the White House spokesman followed.

In actual fact, the king of Jordan said what would seem to be well known things: Israel's continuing occupation of Arab territories is possible only thanks to U.S. military, political, and economic support; the U.S. assistance to Tel Aviv de facto helps Israel to colonize the occupied territories....

These are generally accepted facts, and other Arab leaders have repeatedly spoken of them. But the whole point is that such a statement, coming from King Husayn's lips, acquires special significance for the U.S. Administration. You see, Washington calculated on Jordan in its hopes of getting the so-called "Reagan Plan" for the Near East moving. It was expected that that country would enter separate negotiations with Israel and would bring along the PLO leadership. It is understandable that this was highly necessary for the U.S. President and his administration following the harsh defeat in Lebanon, which could not be prevented by either the Marines or the guns and missiles of the U.S. 6th Fleet. It became necessary to clear out of Lebanese soil, and the inequitable Lebanese-Israeli agreement was annulled under pressure from Lebanese patriotic forces.

And now we have yet another misfire. Moreover, it has occurred where it was least expected: Generous military and economic aid was promised to Jordan. It did not work, however. "We have not discerned a U.S. ability to confirm by deeds the pledges it has made," the Jordanian head of state said. "It no longer enjoys trust as mediator in a Near East settlement. It is quite obvious that we cannot deal with the United States while it acts as an ally of Israel."

The Near East press notes that Jordan's position is completely logical under the conditions of exacerbated anti-American feelings in the Arab world, which has condemned the U.S. use of armed force and the methods of pressure and blackmail in Lebanon. Judging by everything, however, Washington intends to continue along the path it has followed so far. Voices can already be heard in the U.S. capital speaking of the need to "teach Jordan a lesson," especially by refusing military assistance, and to step up support for Israel.

The continuing reliance on strength is indicated by recent news reports about the urgent transfer of AWACS-equipped U.S. Air Force reconnaissance aircraft to Egypt and Sudan and about the concentration of the U.S. Navy in the Persian Gulf area. To put it briefly, the United States is unwilling to renounce the diktat and big stick policy which has been rejected by the peoples in the Arab and other developing countries.

U.S. CANCELS STINGER TO TEACH JORDAN 'LESSON'

LD221618 Moscow TASS in English 1512 GMT 22 Mar 84

[Text] Washington March 22 TASS -- According to a White House spokesman, President Reagan has decided to cancel supplies of Stinger air defense missiles to Jordan. The White House tries to justify that decision by "growing congressional opposition" to the administration's plans.

Observers point out, however, that Washington has decided in this way "to teach a lesson" to King Husayn of Jordan, who sharply criticized in a series of recent interviews U.S. policy in the Middle East and Washington's encouragement of Tel Aviv's expansion. In a NEW YORK TIMES interview King Husayn said, for instance, that the continued occupation of Arab lands by Israel had become possible only because of U.S. military, economic and political aid.

As the TV company NBC points out, after Husayn criticized U.S. Mid-Eastern policy, President Reagan has scrapped that plan, provoking outrage among the Arabs.

The decision of the U.S. Administration shows that Washington intends to deny Jordan means to defend itself in the face of the threat posed by Israel, whose predatory policy is completely supported by the White House.

The scrapping of the plans to sell air defense missiles to Jordan after Washington was publicly condemned by King Husayn has become the culmination of a series of defeats sustained by U.S. policy in the Middle East, THE NEW YORK TIMES points out.

Amman March 22 TASS -- According to the PETRA NEWS AGENCY, an official spokesman for the Jordanian Government, commenting on the White House's decision, said that the Jordanian Government deeply regretted that U.S. step, which prejudiced the defense potential of the Kingdom.

ARABS DEMAND USSR JOIN IN M.E. SETTLEMENT PROCESS

LD201907 Moscow In Arabic to the Arab World 1530 GMT 20 Mar 84

[From the "Window on the Arab World" program by Rafael Arutyunov]

[Text] King Husayn's recent statements, in which he criticized U.S. Middle East policy, aroused [word indistinct] fury in Washington. It is well known that King Husayn pointed out the unprincipled nature of this policy. He said that the comprehensive U.S. aid to Israel helped the colonization of occupied Arab territories. The Jordanian monarch stressed the importance of holding an international conference to resolve the Middle East problem with the participation of all parties concerned. Indeed, the whole world realizes that capitulatory deals arranged by Washington, such as the Camp David accords or the so-called Reagan Plan, did nothing but push the Middle East issue further back and led to the Lebanese crisis and aggravation of the situation in the Middle East.

It is also well known that the Soviet Union has long been proposing the holding of an international conference on the Middle East, with the participation of all parties concerned, including the PLO. This constructive peace proposal by the Soviet Union has received support at the 38th UN General Assembly Session, which urged the Middle Eastern countries engaged in the conflict and other concerned parties to take part in this widely represented conference.

However, the United States, as in many other matters pertaining to supporting world peace and security, stood in opposition to the international community. The vast majority of U.N. member-countries supported the Soviet proposal for holding an international conference because it coincides with the interests of establishing lasting peace in the tortured Middle East.

It is for this reason that the vast majority of Arab countries are demanding that the Soviet Union definitely take part in the Middle East settlement process.

RESULTS OF LAUSANNE CONFERENCE OUTLINED

PM221247 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Mar 84 Morning Edition p 4

[Special correspondents K. Geyvandov and V. Kuznetsov commentary under the rubric "On a Topical Theme": "Difficult Dialogue"]

[Text] Lausanne -- The Conference on National Reconciliation in Lebanon ended its work 20 March, late at night.

For 9 days, conference participants discussed the submitted documents on the implementation of political, economic, and social reforms in the country and came to the conclusion that it is necessary to set up a constitutional commission that will devote itself to the resolution of practical tasks relating to future arrangements in Lebanon. This commission, comprising 23 representatives, is to elaborate a draft of the country's new constitution and submit the results of its work within the next 6 months.

As delegates are emphasizing in conversations with journalists, the main achievement of the Lausanne conference is its decision on the need to stop the internecine struggle and do away with all forms of hostile propaganda activities on the part of the opposing groupings. Conference participants unanimously came out in favor of setting up a supreme security commission (on political and military questions) to be headed by the republic's president and responsible for the implementation of the security plan elaborated by the delegations and for the adoption of measures necessary to ensure the observance of the cease-fire.

The representatives of the opposing groupings focused their attention on the elaboration of principles which they must follow in restoring normal life in the country. The sides agreed that it is necessary to disengage the hostile forces, remove heavy artillery from the zone of hostilities, and draw up a plan for returning the Army to the barracks.

Conference circles emphasize that solving Lebanon's complex internal problems was an impossible task to accomplish in the 9 days of the Lausanne conference. In this context, attention is drawn to the fact that the delegations instructed the president of the republic to carry out regional consultations with a view to implementing structural reforms, restoring unity, and deepening the process of national reconciliation.

The difficult dialogue is continuing, and the foundations have been laid for constructive changes in Lebanon -- this is the immediate reaction and the general tone of Western news media commentaries. "The failure which it proved possible to avoid" -- this is how Paris radio's France-Inter comments on the results of the Lausanne conference. The Swiss newspaper NEUE ZUERCHER ZEITUNG emphasizes: "The main thing is the cease-fire." At the same time, press comments point out that the right-wing Christian groupings bear responsibility for the failure to adopt concrete decisions in Lausanne on implementing radical constitutional reforms, reorganizing the state apparatus and the Army on a democratic basis, strengthening national unity, and abolishing outdated forms of the country's administration.

Under pressure from the Phalangists, the question of ending the Israeli occupation in southern Lebanon has been practically frozen. In an interview with journalists [Lebanese President] Amin al-Jumayyil, obviously acting as someone's mouthpiece, declared that he does not consider this to be an urgent problem for Lebanon at the moment.

U.S., ISRAEL TO CONSTRUCT SATELLITE SPY STATION

LD202207 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Arabic 1630 GMT 20 Mar 84

[Text] Israel and the United States are preparing to sign a contract for the construction of the first spy station in the Middle East for satellite surveillance. It will utilize a laser beam and will be built near Jerusalem. This was disclosed by Neeman, Israel's minister of science and research. Experts point out that the new station is extremely important from the strategic point of view and will have capabilities for spying, monitoring, and surveillance with equipment worth $200-300 million, according to preliminary estimates.

Agreement on this military installation was reached last January during the first session of the American-Israeli joint political-military committee. It was agreed that the United States will create a military reserve, including tanks, artillery and other heavy weapons, for its gendarme Rapid Deployment Force. Thus the issue is that of the implementation of the strategic alliance between Washington and Tel Aviv against the Arabs and the creation of an American military structure within Israel for possible American military operations in the Middle East and other places. A laser spy station for satellite surveillance is a necessary element in the American program for militarization of space.

The Americans -- who are crazy about war -- are ready to threaten mankind, even from space. Naturally, the emergence of a new American military installation in the Middle East does not work toward guaranteeing the security of peoples living there, and it does not work for the restoration of peace and calm in the region. On the contrary, danger to the Arabs has grown many-fold since the signing of the strategic agreements between the American Administration and the Israeli leaders. Any attempt to belittle the danger of the American-Israeli alliance to developments in the Middle East is only aimed at misleading the Arabs. This was stated to AL-AHALI by Kamal ad-Din Husayn, former member of the leadership of revolutionary Egypt. He said that the formation of this alliance and the definite steps taken within its context leave no room for doubt that for Washington, the Middle East is a suitable bridgehead in the event of a military confrontation. American politicians are not in the least interested in the fate and vital aspirations of the peoples living there.

SYRIAN CP LEADER BAKDASH ON LEBANON, CP POLICY

LD221517 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 22 Mar 84

[From the "Workers Movement -- News and Commentary" program presented by Bronislav Myakota, political observer of All-Union Radio and Central Television]

[Text] Let us go over to the situation in the Near East, which has been one of the hottest points on our planet for many years now through the fault of imperialist circles. Our correspondent has interviewed Comrade Khalid Bakdash, secretary general of the Syrian Communist Party Central Committee:

[Begin Bakdash recording in Arabic with superimposed Russian translation] The situation in the Near East is complicated and explosive. American imperialism and its allies from a number of NATO countries are trying to establish full political, military and economic control over our area.

The Americans and their Israeli minions expected Lebanon to be an easy victory for them, but their hopes were shattered. The Lebanese and other Arab peoples are resisting the aggressors. This is precisely what made the United States evacuate its Marines from Lebanese territory to the warships concentrated off the coast. One of the main factors in the success of our struggle is the strengthening of the union between Syria, the national patriotic forces of Lebanon, and the Palestinian revolution.

On the other hand -- and this gives us confidence and fresh strength -- the whole world knows of the enormous role played by the Soviet Union in supporting the struggle of the popular masses and progressive forces of the Arab countries against the aggressors. It is by no means easy for American imperialism to realize its plans in the region, for they are at odds with the interests of the Arab peoples and with the course of history itself.

We shall continue to follow the path for consolidating the independence of our countries and liberating occupied lands, a path of social progress. One of the most important tasks facing Syrian Communists is to strengthen Syria's constant anti-imperialist, anti-Zionist policy. We are striving to resolve this task in cooperation with all the progressive forces in the country, primarily the Arab Socialist Ba'th Party. But this does not mean that we have abandoned the struggle for the social interests of the working people, the interests of workers and peasants. We are fighting to make the country and its army and people ready to resist the aggressive intrigues of American imperialism and Israel. We communists are making every effort to unite as many forces as possible on this basis. We shall continue to adhere to this course. I am confident that the Syrian people are capable or repelling any act of aggression and defending and consoldiating their national independence. [end recording]

AL-ASAD MEETS WITH NEWLY FORMED GOVERNMENT

LD212021 Moscow TASS in English 2007 GMT 21 Mar 84

[Text] Damascus March 12 TASS -- In conditions of the continued intrigues of imperialism, Zionism and reaction the Syrian people must redouble the efforts to develop national economy, consolidate the state sector, President of the Syrian Arab Republic Hafiz al-Asad said at a meeting with members of the recently formed government headed by Prime Minister 'Abd ar-Ra'uf al-Kasm.

Hafiz al-Asad confirmed Syria's principled stand in relations with Arab countries and pointed to the need of consolidation of inter-Arab solidarity. Hafiz al-Asad said Syria will continue giving assistance to the Lebanese people in achieving national accord. He spoke highly of the struggle of the Lebanese national patriotic forces that achieved the annulment of the shackling agreement with Israel that has been imposed on Lebanon by the United States.

Despite the political, economic and military pressure of imperialism headed by the United States Syria will continue invariably advancing along the anti-imperialist course, the president.

Touching upon Syrian-Soviet relations Hafiz al-Asad said that they are of long-term nature, meet the interests of the peoples of both countries. Our relations are good, he stressed. We have a common stand on all the main problems. The Soviet Union supports the struggle of the Syrian people. The head of state urged members of the government to declare actively for further development of Syrian-Soviet relations and strengthening of cooperation with the USSR and other socialist countries.

SUDAN RAID PRETEXT FOR U.S. TO ATTACK LIBYA

PM221625 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Mar 84 First Edition p 5

[Vitaliy Korionov commentary under the rubric "Political Observers' Remarks": "Sowers of Tension"]

[Text] Events in the last few days have once again confirmed how feverishly people in Washington seek out the slightest opportunity to exacerbate international tension. It is not important where -- be it in Central America, the Near East, or Africa -- nor is is it important what episode is chosen as a pretext. Only one thing is important: find an opportunity to create yet another "hot spot."

In the latest instance, reports about a raid by an unidentified aircraft on a radio station in a suburb of Subdan's capital, Khartoum, served as a pretext.

Right away two U.S. aircraft equipped with the AWACS electronic reconnaissance systems flew out of Tinker AFB, Oklahoma, to Egyptian territory, which is closer to Sudan. A USAF fighter squadron is also making its way there at the same time, the question of shipping U.S. military equipment to Sudan is being discussed in the U.S. capital.

No one can accurately say who it was that carried out the raid. Moreover, for some unknown reason, the aircraft was neither intercepted nor attacked by Sudan's air defense system. Even the Western press voices suppositions that the issue amounts to a stage-managed affair in order to create an "external threat," since the Sudanese regime has long been experiencing an acute crisis. Nonetheless, the reactionary press immediately alleged that Libya was involved in this episode. The appropriate Libyan organs have refuted this claim. But the "deed" has already been done: yet another noisy "Libyan threat" campaign is being fanned. And this is not all: a flood of declarations about a a... "communist danger" in Africa has come out of Khartoum. The atmosphere the White House needed has been created, to be followed by orders that U.S. aircraft should make their way to Sudan. Furthermore, as Britain's DAILY TELEGRAPH reports, "The Reagan administration is studying the question of organizing a special airlift to Sudan." The United States has already given that country $52 million of arms procurements.

The following detail is also interesting: according to the French newspaper LE MONDE, this entire venture was preceded by a visit to Khartoum by Washington's special envoy Vernon Walters, former deputy director of the U.S. CIA, whose service record contains quite a few affairs unsuitable for the glare of publicity...

As a result of the growing U.S. threats to Libya, the latter has requested a UN Security Council session to discuss the developing situation. Washington's actions, Tripoli declares, are preparations for direct U.S. aggression against Libya, and the story about the "Libyan aircraft" has been fabricated as a pretext for it. Being a crude violation of the UN Charter, the Libyan memorandum notes, Washington's actions are posing a threat to peace and security in the Near East.

There is only one thing to say in connection with the present U.S. claims about the aircraft in question: the handwriting is familiar! Whenever Washington needs to justify its unseemly actions, it pulls out of mothballs the ghost of some scarecrow or other and, by parading it, begins to cover up what it has done in one region while distracting attention from the dangerous actions carried out by the relevant U.S. services elsewhere. This is how things are in this instance, too.

Nevertheless, no smokescreens can hide from the peoples the real schemes by the sowers of international tension.

U.S. Campaign Against Libya

LD211938 Moscow in Arabic to the Arab World 1500 GMT 21 Mar 84

[Commentary by Aleksey Zlatorinskiy entitled: "President Reagan's Attempts at Revenge"]

[Excerpts] The feeling of bewilderment and confusion which overpowered the Reagan administration after the forced withdrawal of the U.S. Marines from Lebanese territory, the abrogation of the Lebanese-Israeli 17 May, 1983 agreement, and the speech by Jordanian Monarch King Husayn in which he exposed the United States, is gradually disappearing.

The U.S. President and his ministers should have listened to the wise recommendations at that time, particularly about the need to reconsider U.S. foreign policy in the Middle East. The failure of this policy is very clear, to the extent that even official U.S. public figures, members of the U.S. Senate and Congress and others have been forced to make the same recommendations.

However, Reagan defiantly says that he does not want to listen to any one, and has been intent on one objective -- namely, revenge for his foreign policy defeats, which are pouring in on him as though [words indistinct].

President Reagan has made his speeches substantially more openly hostile to the Soviet Union, hoping to rally the reactionary forces under his banner. He was gathered the leaders of Zionist organizations in the United States and stressed to them that the United States will do its utmost to ensure Israel's absolute military superiority in the Middle East and to make Israel a secure shield to protect the Arab countries from Soviet infiltration.

In short, the U.S. President is intent upon revenge to the extent that he personally gives directions to leaders of terrorist organizations in an attempt to instigate them against the true strugglers for freedom, independence, and the right of every people to choose their path.

In the past, the U.S. CIA used to do this dirty work, but not on a higher level. Nevertheless, the CIA will not hesitate to carry out the revenge that the owner of the White House wants to take. Here is an example: Western news agencies reported that on unidentified plane violated Sudanese airspace and released five bombs on the Omdurman radio station, as a result of which Sudan complained to the UN Security Council, accusing the Libyan Jamahiriyah of having committed this aggression, and requested aid from the United States and Egypt. Washington immediately sent two AWACS planes to Sudan with the aim of spying on Libyan airspace. Egyptian troops were sent to the region where [word indistict]

A violent campaign against Libya and the USSR spread in the United States, Egypt, and the Sudan, since Khartoum claims that Egypt [word indistinct] Tripoli's action. However, for everything to appear convincing, an unexploded bomb was discovered alleged to contain the inscription made in the Soviet Union on it.

This is the scenario for the detective story concocted by the CIA currently being spread about by Washington and its agents.

Why this detective story? When Tripoli learned of this talk in Sudan, it was amazed, as no plane had flown from the Libyan Jamahiriyah. The Syrian AL-BA'TH advised the planners of this provocation to examine the map and convince themselves that no plane could fly from the Jamahiriyyah to southern Sudan and return without being detected.

Citing informed sources the paper said that bombing Omduran was blatant play acting aimed at facilitating U.S. and Eyptian and infiltration into a country neighboring Libya, at pouring oil on the fire of the campaign against Libya and the Soviet Union, and at diverting attention from the deteriorating internal situation in Sudan.

Libyans Protest

LD192231 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1950 GMT 19 Mar 84

[From" The World Today" program presented by Eduard Mnatsakanov]

[Text] The other day in Khartoum, the Sudanese capital, an unidentified plane bombed one of the regions of the city. This incident was immediately used by the Reagan administration and the British Government to aggravate a fresh hysterical anti-Libya campaign, and what is more, to transfer fresh consignments of American contemporary weapons to Sudan, the regime everyone knows is totally subserviant to Washington.

The question arises: Was this bombing a crude provocation? It took place just 10 days after the visit to Khartoum by the American emissary, Walters, who held consultations there. There are reports that the Pentagon intends to open an airbridge from Cairo to Khartoum to deliver the latest U.S. military technology.

Meanwhile, in Tripoli, the Libyan capital, and in other towns of the country, mass meetings are being held, some in front of the American and British Embassy buildings, to sharply protest the unceasing anti-Libyan intrigues of Washington and London.

We received this video report this evening. Hundreds of angry people gathered in front of the British Embassy to protest the extradition of Libyan students from London. [shots of chanting demonstrators]

AREAS OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION WITH LIBYA LISTED

LD131514 Moscow TASS in English 1435 GMT 13 Mar 84

[Text] Moscow March 13 TASS -- TASS economic news analyst Nikolay Komarov writes:

Libya has firmly taken the place of the Soviet Union's main trading partner among Arab countries. In the past two years Soviet-Libyan trade reached 1,300 million roubles (1,700 million dollars), a rise of 160 percent over the year of 1981.

The growth in trade testifies to broad and steadily developing cooperation between the two countries. A stable structure of economic links has now established, embracing such industries as power, oil, gas, metallurgical, agricultural and other spheres.

Regular contacts between leaders of the two countries play a major role in strengthening USSR-Libya economic links. The main directions of Soviet-Libyan economic and technical cooperation are specified in the course of reciprocal visits.

The use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes has become an important and prospective sphere of cooperation. Soviet organisation rendered Libya assistance in the construction of the research center not far from Tripoli. It is the biggest such center in the Arab world. Soviet-Libyan economic and scientific-technical cooperation in geology, training of cadres and public health, is successfully under way. Activities of Soviet organisations, deliveries of the necessary equipment and materials promote establishment of Libya's up-to-date multi-branch economy.

Cooperation between the two countries assumes increasingly more [word indistinct] character which makes it possible to take more precisely into account possibilities and requirements of both sides.

Elaboration of a long-term comprehensive programe of economic and technical cooperation will be of great significance. The basis of the programme will be agreed upon projects and trends of cooperation, and also the new enterprises planned to be built with the help of Soviet specialists in accordance with schemes of development of a number of branches of the Libyan economy.

The relations of the two countries are based on the agreement on economic and technical cooperation which was signed in [date indistinct]. Sessions of the inter-government Soviet-Libyan commission on question of development of economic and scientific-technical cooperation and also trade are held every year. Industrial subcommissions and working groups are actively functioning.

The latest, ninth session of the commission was held in Tripoli in autumn last year. The session discussed a broad range of questions concerning the current moment and the future. Accords were reached, specifically on further expansion of cooperation in the sphere of oil and chemical industry, transport, communications and agriculture.

ALGERIAN INFORMATION MINISTER CONCLUDES VISIT

LD211554 Moscow World Service in English 1200 GMT 21 Mar 84

[Text] The personal representative of the Algerian president, Information Minister Bachir Rouis, has left the Soviet Union. Yesterday he was received by Soviet Foreign Minister Andrey Gromyko. They exchanged views on pressing international issues. Referring to the Middle East, Andrey Gromyko and Bachir Rouis confirmed the need to withdraw Israeli troops from Lebanon and to end the interventionist actions of the United States and Israel against the Arab countries.

MEETING HAILS USSR-YAR TIES ON ANNIVERSARY

PM221518 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Mar 84 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Dedicated to Anniversary"]

[Text] Soviet-Yemeni ties are developing successfully on the basis of the principles of equality, sovereignty, territorial integrity, and noninterference in each other's internal affairs. This was noted at a 19 March public meeting in Moscow dedicated to the 20th anniversary of the Friendship Treaty between the USSR and the Yemen Arab Republic [YAR]. A.'U. Muhammad, YAR ambassador to the USSR, noted the great significance of cooperation with the USSR for the development of the YAR's national economy.

Greetings to YAR President

LD211336 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Mar 84 Morning Edition p 2

[TASS Report: "Exchange of Greetings"]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has sent 'Ali 'Abdallah Salih, president of the Yemen Arab Republic, a telegram conveying to the president and the friendly Yemeni people congratulations and best wishes on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the signing of the friendship treaty between the Soviet Union and the Yemen Arab Republic.

In his telegram in connection with this date, 'Ali 'Abdallah Salih conveyed to the Soviet leadership and peoples of the friendly Soviet Union sincere and cordial congratulations and good wishes on behalf of the government and people of the Yemen Arab Republic and himself personally. The cables express confidence that the traditional relations of friendship between the USSR and the Yemen Arab Republic will continue to strengthen to the benefit of the two countries' peoples and in the interests of strengthening peace and security in the Near East.

U.S., RSA 'BENEFACTION' WILL NOT HELP UNITA

LD201213 Moscow TASS in English 1100 GMT 20 Mar 84

[Text] Moscow March 20 TASS -- "UNITA [National Union for the Total Independence of Angola] has no future. 'Benefaction' of the CIA and the national intelligence service of the Republic of South Africa won't help", Sergey Demidov writes in PRAVDA.

The author points out that periods of the UNITA gangs' peak activities coincide as a rule with the South African racists' large-scale acts of aggression against Angola. The South African aggression in December 1983 - January 1984 and the UNITA's atrocities caused disaster and sufferings to people and substantial damage to property.

After a ceasefire agreement between Luanda and Pretoria and the beginning of the withdrawal of South African troops from Angola was announced, the UNITA ringleader Jonas Savimbi said bluntly that he would "continue the struggle" despite whatever international diplomatic agreements. In other words, UNITA intends to go on killing, to carry on the struggle against the Angolan people.

"Pretoria lavishly provided for the UNITA bases on Namibia's territory to train Savimbi-led thugs", the author of the article writes. "The South African national intelligence service coordinates the subversive, terroristic activities of UNITA bandits, pumping intelligence information out of them, smuggling saboteurs and spies through UNITA channels."

"They in Pretoria regard Savimbi as 'their man' in Angola", says the article. "This is also the point of view of the U.S. CIA which donates a lavish share of funds for the upkeep of UNITA. In the past few years, Washington spent 'unofficially' as many as 100 million dollars for the purpose. The puppets are paying off with brigandage the money, both rands and dollars, which flow in an endless stream from the Republic of South Africa and from across the ocean."

ERITREA'S ECONOMIC PROGRESS, SEPARATIST PROBLEM

PM211455 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Mar 84 First Edition p 6

[Own correspondent A. Serbin report: "Everyday Life in the Province"]

[Excerpts] Addis Ababa, Asmera, March -- On the plane flying from Addis Ababa to Asmera, I looked through some clippings on Eritrea which I had taken from recent newspapers. They said that industry in this northern province of Ethiopia fulfilled the 1982-1983 plan (the economic year begins in July here) by 99 percent and yielded output worth 288 million Ethiopian dollars; 56 kindergartens have recently been built in the province; 5 people from the separatists' camp (their names were given) went over to the side of the revolutionary power; and so forth.

The lines of the newspaper reports are meager, but reading between them you can perceive the province's life today. The Ethiopian revolution is undergoing special trials here and receiving special tempering. This is associated with the difficult destiny which fell to Eritrea's lot.

In 1975-1978, its capital, Asmera, and the entire province went through difficult times because of the armed actions of separatist groupings. The "Eritrea question" confronted the revolution as a legacy of the feudal-monarchist regime which the revolution ousted. Nor is it difficult to perceive the connection between the emergence of separatism and the prolonged isolation of this Ethiopian territory from the main part of the country.

From 1890 to 1941 it was under the Italians' power. It then fell into the hands of the British. Only in 1952 was it reunited with Ethiopia, first on the basis of autonomy, and 10 years later becoming fully merged.

The separatist movement for the detachment of Eritrea emerged in the early sixties. At first, during the existence of the monarchy, the aura of the antifeudal movement clung to some extent to separatism. However, that aura was dispelled when the revolution was victorious in Ethiopia. The new authorities proclaimed the equality of all ethnic groups in the country, defined methods of achieving that equality in practice along the paths of socialist orientation, and reaffirmed the right of every ethnic group to decide its own destiny. Measures were adopted to achieve mutual understanding with the separatists. However, their leaders refused to perceive the revolutionary reality. At precisely the time when the new Ethiopia was undergoing the critical period of formation, they launched extensive military operations against the country's unity, which led to many casualties. Many enterprises, hospitals, bridges, and schools were destroyed, and the economic life of Eritrea, which accounted for more than 30 percent of Ethiopia's industrial potential, was paralyzed. The separatists received support from certain Arab regimes and from the Somalis, who encroached on Ethiopia from the southeast. The Ethiopian press also pointed to the direct link between the opponents of national unity and imperialist circles.

In 1978 Ethiopia's revolutionary army inflicted a major defeat on the separatists' main forces. As a result of this victory and subsequent operations by government troops, the situation was stabilized over most of Eritrea, and the conditions emerged for the continuation of revolutionary transformations.

January 1982 saw the beginning of a wide, multifaceted campaign to develop Eritrea, a campaign called "Red Star," covering all political, economic, and social aspects of life. The national conference in Asmera, in which leaders of the Commission for Organizing the Party of the Working People of Ethiopia [COPWE], the Provisional Military Administrative Council, and government institutions and representatives of mass organizations from all the country's provinces participated, defined the goals and means of pursuing this campaign. It envisaged restoring and reconstructing Eritrea's economy, creating the foundations for the total normalization of the situation, and putting an end to the separatists' destructive actions. The manifesto adopted at the conference again appealed to the separatists to think again and take advantage of the amnesty declared by the central authorities.

People in the West misrepresented the campaign and presented it as purely a military operation. In fact, operation "Red Star" particularly marked a new stage in Eritrea's socioeconomic development. More than 275 million Ethiopian dollars have already been invested in its various programs for economic reconstruction and for improving living conditions in the province, not counting the 27 million granted to the population by the National Commission for Aid and Restoration.

The economic results of the Eritrea campaign are marked and tangible.

As life in Eritrea falls into its normal course and revolutionary transformations become increasingly extensive, the foundations of separatism are eroded and the crisis in its ranks deepens. The vestiges of the separatist forces are now entrenched in mountain regions in the north of the province. Groups belonging to the movement are fighting among themselves. Not for nothing has the exodus from the separatists' ranks increased sharply.

The "Eritrea problem" has not yet been fully resolved. A curfew is in force in Asmera at night. In the course of the "Red Star" campaign, workers and peasants are taught to use arms to defend themselves against separatist gangs. But Eritrea is gradually settling into the general rhythm of the life of a country engaged in building a new society.

MATERIALS CONCERNING LUGANSK TANKER INCIDENT

U.S. Reaction to Protest

LD221914 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1745 GMT 22 Mar 84

[From the "International Diary" program, presented by Sergey Pravdin, with station commentary by Viktor Levin]

[Excerpts] Greetings, esteemed comrades. The mass information media comment extensively on the USSR Government note to the United States in connection with the criminal act against the Soviet ship Lugansk.

How is official Washington reacting to the Soviet Government protest? I shall ask our commentator Viktor Levin to reply to this question.

I have in front of me two telegrams. One sets out the position of the official spokesman of the White House; the other of the State Department. Washington, it seems, has decided to give a salvo of replies, which is considerably more in accord with military rather than diplomatic practice. But it is this approach that is today the definitive one in the U.S. capital.

What does the White House assert? Despite the clearly expressed warning in the Soviet protest that the United States would bear full responsibility for the consequences with which the continuation of such actions as the criminal act against the Soviet tanker Lugansk are fraught, Speakes, the White House spokesman, gave assurances that, allegedly, this act of brigandage and piracy would have no effect on relations between Moscow and Washington. As can be seen, the U.S. Administration supposes that it can trample on the basic principles of international law, including the law of free navigation, and get away with it.

This is a dangerous delusion, and the Soviet Government protest leaves no doubt about this. The State Department representative, Romberg, stated that the United States rejects the accusation that it is conducting a policy of state terrorism. Frankly speaking, it would be naive to expect an admission from Washington that the United States is conducting such a policy. Secret operations, subversive actions, and undeclared war are acts to which one does not wish to admit. However, at the very same time when Speakes and Romberg were trying to lift the obvious responsibility for the piratical act from the United States, Congress was continuing to discuss the administration's request to allocate a further $21 million to support the counter-revolutionary rabble which, under the leadership of the CIA, is attempting to smash the Sandinist revolution in Nicaragua. U.S. participation in the undeclared war against Nicaragua is so obvious that when White House representative Speakes was asked directly whether U.S. funds were used to buy mines, and whether the United States was giving aid in laying them near Nicaraguan shores, he did not reply. By the way, Romberg also refused to reply to a question on whether the mines floating near the Port of Sandino were American.

Washington has acquired the habit of expounding on morals, norms of conduct -- very often with attacks on the USSR -- but as soon as specific acts are involved it seems as if it is has swallowed its tongue.

In brief, if the truth is told, the United States conducts a policy of terrorism, arbitrariness, and interference in the affairs of sovereign and independent states; this is incompatible with the generally accepted norms of law and morals, and creates a threat to peace and internatonal security.

U.S. 'Totally Distorting' Facts

LD221301 Moscow TASS in English 1240 GMT 22 Mar 84

[Text] Moscow March 22 TASS -- TASS political news analyst Yuriy Kornilov writes:

Anger and indignation are the words characterising the reaction of the Soviet and international public to the act of brigandage and piracy perpetrated with Washington's direct participation off the shores of Nicaragua against the Soviet tanker ship "Lugansk". Widely commenting on the note of the USSR Government, which was handed in this connection to the United States charge d'affaires in Moscow, prominent political and public figures in different countries and the press stress that the unlawful, to be more precise, criminal actions of the USA create a serious threat to peace and international security. These actions are absolutely incompatible with the generally accepted norms of law and morals and cannot be tolerated in the civilised world!

It is known that a criminal, who launched a bandit raid, a pirate, who attacked a peaceful merchant ship, always tries to cover up the traces of his crimes. This is precisely the way they in Washington who bear direct responsibility for the act of brigandage off Nicaragua's shores are acting today. It is noteworthy that offical and ranking representatives of the Washington administration do not confine themselves to absolutely unfounded and demagogic in their essence statements to the effect that the USA is allegedly not responsible for the incident. The U.S. State Department has issued a "statement" totally distorting the facts and going so far as to say that it is not the USA, but...the Soviet Union which is responsible for the tensions in the region, and therefore, it is claimed that the USSR hardly has the right to accuse others of the recently more frequent outbreaks of violence there. Such impudent (as they may be aptly called) statements come none other than from Washington, whose policy has already long been aimed at crudest, shameless armed and other interference in the affairs of Central American and Latin American states! Such statements are made by those who unleashed and are continuing the "undeclared" war against sovereign Nicaragua, who launched a bandit attack against Grenada, who openly patronise the criminal junta usurping power in El Salvador, support Chilean butchers and facists, continue threats against revolutionary Cuba. Indeed, there is no limit to the pharisaism of the Washington politicos!

It is not only in Central and Latin America that the latter-day Washington crusaders, who are out to recarve by force the political map of the world to their liking, commit acts of crying arbitrary rule and lawlessness. The crimes in that region are just a component part of their global hegemonistic policy, which is extremely dangerous to the cause of peace. In the Middle East, the USA is a direct accomplice in the acts of vandalism and genocide perpetrated by the Zionist militarists on Lebanon's long-suffering soil. In Asia, Washington engineers ever more aggressive sorties against Afghanistan, accompanying them with a malicious anti-Afghan and anti-Soviet outcry. In Africa it patronises the racists of the Republic of South Africa and steps up provocations against Angola.

According to the American Brookings Institute, over the past six years alone, the United States Administration, which has declared almost the whole world to be a "sphere of American vital interests" resorted to armed actions or threat of force in 38 instances in relations with the other countries. Everywhere the tentacles of United States imperialism, of the U.S. secret services, their minions and agents reach, the blood of innocent people is shed, seats of tensions are created and a real threat to freedom and independence of peoples emerges.

Irrefutable facts, the entire activities of the United States in the international arena again and again prove that the pivot of the American foreign policy is stake placed on force, on aggression and diktat, the international brigandage and terrorism have been elevated by the present-day Washington rulers to the status of government policy!

The act of piracy perpetrated against a Soviet tanker ship off Nicaragua's shores is another disgraceful page in the gloomy chronicle of the aggressive foreign policy of the United States. This heinous act also shows the real worth of the statements made by the Washington administration about its readiness to work for lessening international tensions, its calls for restraint, non-use of force or threat of force.

Levchenko Commentary

LD221609 Moscow World Service in English 1410 GMT 22 Mar 84

[Text] The Soviet Government has strongly protested to the American Government about a criminal against a Soviet tanker. The Lugansk hit a mine and suffered damage as it approached the Nicaraguan Port of Sandino on Tuesday. Here is a commentary by Leonid Levchenko:

The Soviet Government's note described the incident as an act of brigandage and piracy. Its perpetrators are well known. They are mercenaries recruited by American special services from among the accompliaces of the dictator Somoza who was overthrown by the Nicaraguan people. Washington is using these mercenaries to commit all kinds of aggressive actions against free Nicaragua.

In the past 2 years it has supplied them through the channels of the Central Intelligence Agency with $55 million to train and arm bands in Honduras and Costa Rica who then make forays into Nicaragua to plunder, to destroy, and to kill civilians. It is also known that these groups include representatives of American special services.

Lately, these services have worked out and their mercenaries have begun acting on a plan for a sea blockade against Nicaragua. By using CIA-supplied high-speed boats and covered by an American naval armada close to Nicaraguan shores, the mercenaries have been planting mines and other explosive devices in Nicaragua's waters and even ports, which have now damaged several foreign ships. The CIA's mercenaries are also attacking merchant ships heading for Nicaraguan ports. Thereby, with the Washington administration's sanction, they are violating one of the basic principles of international law -- the freedom of navigation.

Washington considers itself above the generally accepted rules of international behavior and is craving for supremacy and exclusiveness, whatever the means may be. It has made it a rule to invade, as it did towards Grenada, and to fire point-blank at peaceful communities, as its killer battleship New Jersey did in Lebanon.

The Nicaraguan leader, Daniel Ortega, has said the Soviet tanker is a victim of the Reagan administration's aggressive policy aimed at stifling the Nicaraguan revolution and unleashing a large-scale conflict in Central America. With its actions, Washington again makes the world speak of terrorism elevated to the rank of state policy. Its cynical resort to force, piracy, and banditry creates a serious threat to international security. This policy is denounced in the strongest terms in the Soviet Government's note of protest.

U.S. 'MUSCLE-FLEXING SHOW' IN C. AMERICA DECRIED

LD131457 Moscow TASS in English 1401 GMT 13 Mar 84

["The Pentagon's Militarist Preparations" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow March 13 TASS -- TASS commentator Oleg Kolesnikov writes:

The Pentagon is going to send a major task force led by the aircraft-carrier "America" to Central American shores in the new few days. Simultaneously it has begun to move combat equipment and some 2,500 American soldiers based in the so-called Panama Canal Zone to Honduras.

According to the official version of the U.S. Defense Department, this troop contingent will be involved in another American-Honduran joint exercise which will start on March 15 and last for several weeks on the border with El Salvador. The prime goal of this planned "muscle-flexing" show is, as was pointed out by NBC television, to demonstrate support to the Salvadoran Army.

The forthcoming maneuvers are codenamed in accordance with the Pentagon's scenario. The American and Honduran troops, who will be involved in them, can at any moment make an incursion into neighboring El Salvador where the pro-American regime is going to stage a farcical "presidential election" on March 25.

Democratic forces in El Salvador and elsewhere in Latin America have condemned this gambit which the Reagan Administration hopes will confuse world public opinion. The White House needs the farce of an "election" to back up its claims about some "progress" achieved in El Salvador in the field of human rights and about the "striving for democracy" by the ruling Salvadoran regime which is receiving all-round military and financial aid from Washington.

American combat equipment and armaments are pouring into El Salvador in an endless stream. The bombs, bullets and shells supplied carry the stamp: "Made in U.S.A." American "advisers" are guiding the actions of Salvadoran punitive troops who have undergone special training at military bases of the United States.

The U.S. Administration is fully to blame for the continuing tragedy of the people of El Salvador where over 45,000 persons were killed in the past few years. But such "trifles" aren't a big worry to Washington. Having set itself the goal of stifling the mounting liberation struggle of the Salvadoran people, it has stubbornly tried to achieve it. The dispatch of a large contingent of American troops to the border with El Salvador is a kind of "vote" by Pentagon generals at the forthcoming "election" in that country.

But this step also attests to the fact that the Unites States is continuing feverish preparations for an armed intrusion into Nicaragua. The United States has set up in Honduras a ramified network of its military bases and electronic espionage stations and keeps there its servicemen on a permanent basis.

Somocist counter-revolutionaries, who have been trained, armed and financed by the U.S. Central Intellegence Agency, are staging bandit raids into Nicaragua from Honduran territory. Honduran troops are more and more often taking part in these forays together with them. As Nicaraguan leaders have emphasized on several occasions, the Reagan administration [word indistinct] on the most dangerous stage in its aggression against revolutionary Nicaragua.

COMMUNIQUE ON CUBAN-ANGOLAN SUMMIT IN HAVANA

PM211147 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 21 Mar 84 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Joint Declaration"]

[Text] Havana, 20 Mar -- A joint declaration of the Governments of the Republic of Cuba and the People's Republic of Angola has been published here.

More than 2 years ago, the Governments of the People's Republic of Angola and the Republic of Cuba, in their joint declaration of 4 February 1982, clearly explained their principled position regarding the tense situation prevailing in the southern cone of Africa. The period that has elapsed since then has only confirmed the justness of all the points contained in that declaration, which has won the approval of international public opinion and the virtually unanimous sympathy of all the countries of the world, with the shameful exception of the Governments of the United States of America and South Africa, which for a number of years have stubbornly insisted on the "linkage" of the question of granting independence to Namibia with the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola -- a pernicious formula devoid of any legal or moral basis and is repudiated worldwide, except by its authors.

The heroic resistance of the Angolan people, firmly supported by their internationalist allies, has persuaded the imperialist aggressors of the impossibility of subjugating the People's Republic of Angola and liquidating its revolutionary process, and has obliged it to accept negotiations on new bases.

The Government of the People's Republic of Angola has constantly kept the Cuban Government informed in detail on the course of the conversations currently being held with South Africa and the United States of America, with the objective, on the part of Angola, of searching for a principled basis for a negotiated solution to the conflict that the Angolan people have faced for years with the South African aggressors, and of creating conditions that will make viable the immediate application of Resolution 435-78 of the UN Security Council and the independence of Namibia.

In accordance with this peace effort on the part of Angola, the joint declaration of 4 February remains fully in effect and constitutes a principled basis for any negotiated solution that will eliminate the existing tension and ensure peace and total independence for the nations of this region.

Reaffirming their adherence to the provisions of that joint declaration, the Governments of Cuba and Angola stress that they will resume, by their own decision and in exercise of their sovereignty, the execution of the gradual withdrawal of the Cuban internationalist military contingent as soon as the following requisites are fulfilled;

1. The unilateral withdrawal of the racist South African troops from Angolan territory.

2. The strict application of Resolution 435-78 of the UN Security Council, the accession of Namibia to its true independence, and the total withdrawal of the South African troops that are illegally occupying that country.

3. An end to any act of direct aggression or threat of aggression against the Republic of Angola on the part of South Africa, the United States of America, and their allies.

Together with these three support requirements it will also be necessary, as the Angolan Government expressed in its 26 August 1983 declaration signed by President Jose Eduardo dos Santos, to end all support to the counterrevolutionary organization UNITA [National Union for the Total Independence of Angola], and any other puppet organization by South Africa, the United States, and their allies. Satisfaction of these demands would mean respect for the norms of international law and the UN Charter, and compliance with the many resolutions issued by the UN Security Council and General Assembly, the Nonaligned Movement, and the OAU.

The Cuban Government, on behalf of the Cuban people, honors the heroism of the Angolan people, who for almost a quarter of a century have been waging a liberation war against the colonialists, the racists, and the imperialist masters and their lackeys, and who have paid a high price in blood in order to gain Angola's independence and to provide internationalist aid to other brother countries.

The Government of the People's Republic of Angola expresses the infinite gratitude of the Angolan people for the internationalist aid of the Cuban people in Angola's liberation struggle during the past two decades, and expresses its highest praise for the generosity, sacrifice, and heroism of the thousands of Cubans who have been sent to Angola to help in the military and civilian fields in order to secure the independence, territorial integrity, and national reconstruction of Angola, thus offering a historic contribution to the cause of all the peoples of the continent.

The two governments express their admiration of and solidarity with the heroic struggle being waged by the peoples of Namibia and South Africa under the direction of the sole legitimate representatives, SWAPO [South-West African People's Organization] and the African National Congress, against the disgraceful apartheid regime, and reaffirm their conviction that such a repugnant regime is historically condemned to disappear.

The joint declaration was signed by Fidel Castro, first secretary of the Communist Party of Cuba Central Committee and chairman of the Cuban Councils of State Ministers, and Jose Eduardo dos Santos, chairman of the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola-Labor Party and president of Angola, who is here on a friendly working visit.

Communique Applauded

LD221342 Moscow in English to Africa 2000 GMT 21 Mar 84

[Texr] Negotiations have been held in Havana between the Cuban leader, Fidel Castro, and the Angolan leader, Jose Eduardo dos Santos. A commentary by Georgiy Tanov:

The talks were a major event in international life, so there has been no lack of all sorts of prediction. Washington and Pretoria, for instance, believed that by the time of the Cuban-Angolan summit, Luanda will in the right condition for negotiating with the United States and South Africa on the terms dictated by them, but obviously in this case they overrated their chances. Angola is basically interested in genuine peace, which is largely connected with granting genuine independence to Angola's southern neighbor, Namibia.

No other African country has suffered so badly from imperialist robbery as Namibia and the People's Republic of Angola have. That's why Angola has no reason to trust South Africa and its American patron. Indeed, what can be more perverted and hypocritical in the way of a political gesture than Washington and Pretoria demonstrating an olive branch now after 9 years of undeclared war against Angola and after decades of colonial oppression of Namibia?

I believe all this explains the letter and spirit of the communique following the Angolan-Cuban summit meeting in Havana. The document advocates a realistic, justified, and genuinely peaceful approach to handling the most acute problems for which South Africa and the United States are to blame. The number one term is the withdrawal of racist South Africa's troops from Angolan territory. And the second term is strick observance of the United National Security Council's Resolution 435 on granting genuine independence to Namibia and withdrawing all South African invader forces from Namibian territory. The terms are absolutely logical and (?fair). And how is it possible to (?provide) a real basis of equality for peace negotiations,conferences and so on if one party is occupying the territory of the other party?

Another demand that South Africa stop its acts of aggression or threats of aggression against sovereign Angola is absolutely justified too. And so is the demand that all aid be ended to the UNITA group operating against Angola and its government [words indistinct].

All these problems are the real causes of tensions in the region, not the presence of the Cuban internationalist groups in Angola of which Washington and Pretoria have been making such a big thing. The Havana communique directly connects the stage-by-stage withdrawal of those troops with two terms: the withdrawal of racist South Africa's troops from Angolan territory, and strict observance of the Security Council's Resolution 435 on independence for Nambia. The two leaders emphasized that the Cuban-Angolan stand is in full conformity with the norms of international law, with numerous resolutions adopted by the United Nations Security Council and General assembly and with decisions taken by the Nonaligned Movement and the Organization of African Unity.

At the Havana meeting, the Cuban and the Angolan leaders showed full understanding of the causes and the effects of the sharply complicated situation in the south of Africa. They reaffirmed their adherence to the principles of internationalist cooperation among progressive forces and [words indistinct] unprecedented attacks launched by the imperialist United States and racist South Africa.

REAGAN REMARKS TO CUBAN 'RABBLE' RIDICULED

PM221524 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 22 Mar 84 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Sordid Means"]

[Text] Washington, 21 Mar -- President R. Reagan has had a meeting in the White House with a motley emigre rabble, including the ringleaders of the Cuban counterrevolutionary rabble. The speech delivered by the head of the Washington administration abounded in foul fabrications against the policy of Cuba and the Soviet Union. The President stated that unless the United States supplies the necessary means to emigre circles, whom he called his friends "next door," then who in the world would believe that the United States would render them military aid in the Near East or Europe?

Reagan's speech shows graphically that when it is a case of specific U.S. political goals and of interference in the internal affairs of other states, in this case in Central America, he does not renounce the use of any means aimed at rendering aid to dictatorships, counterrevolutionary gangs, and other renegades.

'Effort To Win Votes'

LD211459 Moscow in English to North America 0001 GMT 21 Mar 84

[Text] On monday President Reagan spoke before a group of Cuban-Americans in what is widely believed to be an effort to win votes from at least a segment of the Hispanic community. The President trained his sights in harsh rehetoric on Cuba and the Soviet Union, accusing them of trying to seize control of Central America. Thus in part he described Cuba as a roving wolf with hungry eyes and sharp teeth. Well, to take the comparison a bit further, the administration of Ronald Reagan poses as Little Red Riding Hood from the popular fairytale. The invasion of Grenada, the shelling of Lebanon by the battleship New Jersey, the deployment of cruise and Pershipg II missiles in Western Europe, and subversion against Nicaragua are but a few examples of how the administration lost touch with reality in blaming others for the aggravation of the international situation.

As far as the President's audience goes, the Cuban community in Florida is a power base for terrorist operations by the Omega 7, Alpha 66 and other groups against Cuba and its officials at the United Nations. That's why the American President is said to be counting on support of this particular segment of the nation's Hispanic community. They are very receptive to his calls for a confrontation in C. America.

In that same speech, President Reagan sharply denounced the critics of his C. American policies at home. He said that those who tried to link military assistance with human rights are either naive or downright phoney. He was not careful with words. What would you call the people who never blush when testifying to Congress that the human rights situation in El Salvador was improving -- despite the fact that the number of killed by the regime's death squads was constantly on the rise? Phoney would be a very mild definition for them.

To blame the unrest and national liberation struggle in C. America on outside interference, and at the same time disregard the abject poverty of the majority there, the ruthlessness of the pro-American regimes and their corrupted policies, is a very serious problem. It has to do with the administration's grasp of problems. This was once again brought home by President Reagan on Monday. His address to a group of 200 Cuban-Americans (?smacked) of a roving Little Red Riding Hood in the election year.

MOSCOW TV REPORTS REGULAR POLITBURO MEETING

LD221952 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 22 Mar 84

[From the Vremya newscast]

[Text] In the CPSU Central Committee Politburo:

At its regular meeting, the CPSU Central Committee Politburo considered the preliminary results of the nationwide discussion of the CPSU draft project "Basic Directions of Reform of the General and Vocational School." It was noted that discussions of the project had assumed a nationwide scale. Ways of perfecting school work had been considered thoroughly and with interest at meetings of labor collectives, in schools and vocational-training schools, in higher educational institutes and technical colleges, and at teachers conferences.

The CPSU draft was the subject of businesslike discussion at parents' meetings. Materials about schools were reflected every day in the press, and in television and radio programs. The CPSU draft was received everywhere as an important document which developed the Marxist-Leninist concept of a unified labor polytechnic school and its role in shaping the new man, and as a program for further perfecting the general secondary and vocational training of young people in light of the decisions of the 26th party congress and subsequent CPSU Central Committee plenums.

In the course of nationwide discussion, many valuable amplifications and remarks, developing and making the CPSU draft more precise were introduced.

The Politburo agreed with the proposals of the commission on the reform of general and vocational schools with regard to the implementation of the amendments and remarks received in the relevant legal documents, as well as in practical work to improve the work of educational institutions. Note was taken of the major fruitful work done by party and administrative organs, public organizations, labor collectives, and the mass media in connection with holding a nationwide discussion of the school reform project.

Approval was given at the CPSU Central Committee Politburo for the patriotic initiative by Baykal-Amur Mainline railway [BAM] builders' collectives who adopted socialist pledges to complete laying the main line ahead of schedule -- by the 67th anniversary of Great October [November 1984] -- and to open the entire length of the line to traffic a year ahead of the set date. The Politburo noted that this labor initiative has great political significance, as well as significance for the national economy. Opening the line to traffic ahead of schedule will promote an acceleration of the development of the productive forces of Siberia and the Far East, and also the utilization in the economy of major reserves of timber, coal, and other natural resources.

The appropriate party, administrative, trade union and Komsomol organs, and the ministries and departments have been charged with rendering all possible aid to labor collectives and the project's public organizations in the implementation of pledges they have adopted, and with working harder to speed the construction of dwelling houses and cultural and domestic amenities along the BAM, and with making fuller use of the possibilities of socialist competition to complete set commitments for the manufacture and delivery to the project of structures, equipment, apparatus and materials.

The CPSU Central Committee Politburo approved the conversation between Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and GDR Minister of National Defense Hoffmann.

The results of the conversation between Comrade Chernenko and Vogel, member of the German Social Democratic Party Presidium and chairman of the SPD party in the Bundestag, were discussed and approved, as were the talks held with an SPD delegation by a group of USSR Supreme Soviet deputies led by Comrade Ponomarev. The principal subject of the talks was the problem of European security and curbing the arms race, in connection with the deployment of new U.S. missiles on the territory of a number of Western European countries.

The Politburo stressed the importance of the stipulations expressed during the talks concerning the need to strive for a real and drastic change for the better in the dangerous development of events in the world, for halting the arms race and for a solution of the problem of nuclear armaments based on observance of the principle of equality and equal security.

The results of the visit to the Republic of India by Comrade Ustinov were examined. The Politburo noted that the meetings and talks held with Indian statesmen and military officials are of great importance for the further strengthening of all-round Soviet-Indian cooperation.

The Politburo heard and approved a report by Comrade Gromyko on his conversation with Bachir Rouis, candidate member of the Algerian National Liberation Front Party and minister of information.

During a discussion of the results of Comrade Aliyev's trip to the Syrian Arab Republic, it was stressed that the steady development and widening of relations between the Soviet Union and Syria are in the interests of the peoples of the two countries and the cause of peace in the Near East.

The Politburo session discussed questions connected with preparations for the first session of the USSR Supreme Soviet of the 11th convocation and certain other issues to do with implementation of the internal and external policies of the CPSU and the Soviet state.

LITERARY CRITICS, JOURNALS SCORED FOR POOR WORK

PM221455 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Feb 84 First Edition p 3

[Yevgeniy Sidorov article: "Keenness of Vision: Ideology and Skill"]

[Text] Today we have a major, developed, multinational literature. We also have mature criticism, represented in each of the union republics by a whole string of talented masters of the genre. But for all the successes and achievements of literature and criticism, one cannot help seeing the substantial shortcomings and contradictions inherent in the contemporary literary process. It is thus an urgent task to take a searching look at our critical affairs and see how effectively and successfully literary criticism is carrying out its mission.

The June (1983) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee stressed that the main method of influencing artistic work must be Marxist-Leninist criticism, which must be active, sensitive, attentive, and at the same time implacable toward ideologically alien and professionally weak works.

In order to actively influence creative work, criticism needs high social and artistic prestige; both readers and writers must have faith in it. The most significant works created in the fraternal literatures in recent years have been noted by the critics, analyzed in depth by them, and brought to the center of public discussion.

It is important to stress that discussions of books have invariably gone beyond purely literary confines and encroached on reality itself -- in complete accordance with Marxist-Leninist critical tradition, where the main criterion of truth is the real link between the work of art and the living material which engendered it, its truthfulness and artistic merit from the viewpoint of socialist practice and the communist ideal. An important gain of recent times is the creative atmosphere of debates and literary discussions.

All the same, surveying the present state of journals' criticism, you often feel dissatisfied. Critical articles sometimes lack two important qualities: a publicistic approach and a clear-cut methodological, theoretical basis. Judgements are not infrequently based solely on the taste of the writer of the article and are not always backed up by convincing arguments.

The second thing which attracts attention is the too rare appearance of notable, brilliant articles devoted to leading trends and laws governing the contemporary literary process. Discussions take place on the periphery of that process and are dissipated in details; criticism lacks profound generalizations.

The CPSU Central Committee resolution "On the Creative Links Between Literary and Artistic Journals and the Practice of Communist Building" notes: "The journals publish works of literary history and literary criticism whose authors clearly cannot cope with complex material, who betrary confusion in their world outlook and an inability to examine social phenomena historically and from clear class standpoints."

It would not be correct to claim that criticism has become tolerant of deviations from the historical approach or from class standpoints in the evaluation of events in the country's past or of Soviet revolutionary history. Our journals have printed principled articles on this score. But what is alarming is the fact of the appearance of critical materials which basically present revolution and culture, the ethnic and class approaches [narodnost I klassnost], as antithetical.

Soviet literary criticism will not fulfill its mission unless it fights actively and purposefully for the new hero and supports a genuine artistic quest in the sphere of socially significant problems, upholding the principles of the party and ethnic approaches precisely in their conjoined form, in indissoluble unity.

But this struggle, in its turn, is impossible without a clear idea of the nature of the charm and power of the artistic word, the artistic image, of what is good and what is bad in literature. Neutrality run riot, failure to make keen judgements about superficial, exploitative work, the fostering of mediocrity purely because it is quickest to respond to topical subject matter -- these are substantial evils in criticism in the journals, criticism which sometimes lacks a clear-cut, principled approach in its evaluations.

In the main, for all its achievements, criticism is still far removed from purposeful, intensive work aimed at the successful implementation of the tasks set in recent party documents. What is most important is that its atmosphere of placid appeasement so often signally fails to conform to the spirit of exacting, keen criticism of shortcomings in our society's life which now emanates from the pages of newspapers and journals.

Open the review pages of the literary journals, and you will see a totally uniform picture of standard, mass-produced approving responses. Works are often praised not for their artistic treatment of their content, but for the content itself or, alternatively, for the author's good qualities.

For instance: "The author has a rare ability to give due credit for his heroes' talent and experience of life..." Sometimes the praise is stepped up in inverse proportion to the grounds provided by the text: "A situation which is banal at first glance, but gains depth under the writer's keen gaze..."

Journal criticism sometimes loses all sense of moderation and tact in comparing contemporary works with the classics of our country's literature and world literature. A unique example of this is provided by Aleksandr Baygushev's long article "Romanticism Today," published in installments in three issues of the journal MOLODAYA GVARDIYA. The author, like all of us, has every reason to be proud of contemporary Soviet literature. But he really goes overboard in his global generalizations and comparisons, in his bold sallies into the problems of the world literary process. Merely to list the names of the philosophers, psychologists, sociologists, and literary critics of many countries and peoples to whom A. Baygushev refers would take up several pages of text. One cannot help recalling the famous rejoinder from Chekhov's play: "They want to show off their education, so they are always talking about something incomprehensible." Anatoliy Sofronov, in the critic's view, draws in an inspired way, perhaps for the first time in Soviet poetry, on the modern idea of "five-dimensional space." What that may be in relation to poetry, is well and truly incomprehensible. It is said of some of our contemporary writers who represent the "Siberian novel" current that they anticipated "the sensational success of Gabriel Marquez," and from the subsequent arguments it appears that this current is certainly no weaker, and in some respects even stronger than Faulkner. This whole so-called aesthetic treatise is distinguished by a tone which swoons with enthusiasm and at the same time is flowery and free and easy. A. Baygushev's relatively ancient article need not have been mentioned, were it not for the fact that the MOLODAYA GVARDIYA editorial office awarded the author the prize for the year's best critical feature, thus apparently confirming its programmatic nature.

Another example. LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA published a review by Natalya Smirnova of Nikolay Dorizo's tragedy in verse "The Third Duel" [Tretya Duel], devoted to Pushkin. This review too is executed in a style of lyrical ecstasy which has a slightly stunning effect even on someone accustomed to it. Here is what the reviewer writes: In the play "Griboyedov's principle shines through: The heroes are ambivaler , trivalent (?), everything is unusually complicated," "there are numberless (!) possibilities for interpretation, improvization, lively imagination." In conclusion the article says: This "unusually poetic play 'cries out' about the lack of talent, the indifference of the present-day equivalents of D'Anthes [who killed Pushkin in a duel] and Von Heckeren [stepfather of D'Anthes]. The plan 'cries out' not literally, but through subtle (in the Chekhovian sense) analysis of character..."

It is embarrassing to read these studies which place really good writers in an awkward position, whose creative work is worthy of serious analysis, not pseudoscientific theorizing.

In recent years the quantity of anniversary articles and notices of all kinds in our periodicals has increased sharply. There is not enough manpower for serious analytical criticism, because many central and noncentral journals must roll up their sleeves and supply their pages with articles pegged to the 50th, 60th, or 70th birthday of some literary figure -- either a real live local "classical"writer or simply a good friend of the journal. This is a particular fault of LITERATURNYY AZERBAIJAN, MOSKVA, NASH SOVREMENNIK, RADUGA, DON, NEMAN, OKTYABR, DAUGAVA, SIBIRSKIY OGNI, and DETSKAYA LITERATURA.

Nobody will object to a serious item devoted to a major literary figure and timed to coincide with an anniversary. But the abundance of "memorials for the living" does not help create in literature an atmosphere of exactingness in writers toward themselves, modesty, or true dignity.

A special genre is criticism by writers, which has also become very widespread today. It is only fair to say that brilliant, interesting work can be found here. All the same, analytical articles and reviews by writers are drops in an ocean of eulogistic bombast. "His path...has the vigor of a mountain stream," "the river of his life is wide and flows in a deep current," the poet Anatoliy Parpara writes of the poet Vladimir Tsybin, confiding in the reader that this is an artist literally "immersed in world culture," a brilliant connoisseur of "philosophy and literature, history and astronomy." Another writer, Boris Kulikov, is also unsparing or rather, unselective, in his use of epithets when he pictures a senior comrade: "I have always been amazed by his unusual capacity for work...his uncommon sensitivity toward the Russian language, his inexhaustible love of life, his generous hospitality." Then there is his "ineffable strength and enviable skill." Thus B. Kulikov has reached the limit, you can rise no higher -- that same sensitive Russian language will not let you, it does not yet have any other, more superlative level.

The devaluation of critical language and immoderate praise harm both the reader and the writer. They can mislead the reader, and in the writer (even if he does not recognize this in himself) they gradually develop a taste for praise, as a result of which the capacity for sober self-analysis inevitably atrophies.

Matters are not helped by the relapses into the use of the critical "big stick," the unsubstantiated blasts which are found, albeit rarely, in present-day practice in the journals. Thus Ivan Kuzmichev, a critic from Gorkiy, in the article "Not Required Reading" published in the journal VOLGA, literally slashed the entire creative work of the writer I. Grekova, declaring it to be a typical example of "ladies'" prose. In order to give an idea of the critic's arguments, I will quote just a few lines from the article: "The character of Anfisa Gromova in I. Grekova's latest story 'The Widow's Steamship' [Vdoviy Parokhod] is realized in a really ladylike way. In essence we are presented with the life of one old woman among other old women, in the almost total absence of men." Surely it is blasphemy to talk like that about a story which is tragic by its very nature -- after all, it is a widow's steamship! War, suffering, women's lives destroyed -- none of this seems to exist for Kuzmichev. This is not merely a case of aesthetic error, but of moral obtuseness.

There may be various ways of looking at the creative work of Andrey Voznesenskiy. But the method of studying this poet's work which was displayed in the pages of the journal V MIRE KNIG (No. 10, 1983) far oversteps the bounds of literary rules and conventions. The author of the article tries to "reflect on the link between Voznesenskiy's poetry and the traditions of Mayakovskiy." The "reflections" are constructed on the following disingenuous principle: Take Mayakovskiy's poems about the meaning of life and creativity, about patriotism, about love, and compare them with tendentiously selected lines from Voznesenskiy apparently on the same theme. The conclusion is clear: "However sophisticated the study of metaphors and associations, the famous, widely published modern poet turns out to be as far from Mayakovskiy's traditions as the angels and monks who inhabit his poems are from our seething reality."

I would like to ask the journal's staffers: What if this "progressive" method of comparative analysis were to be extended universally, bringing in not only Mayakovskiy, but Pushkin, Nekrasov, Tyutchev, and other classical figures in the country's literature, so as to strictly test certain contemporary poets by means of parallel thematic quotations?

It is clear that manipulating classical names in criticism can serve two different purposes -- either to aggrandize or to bring down contemporary writers. But it amounts to the same thing. Both methods are equally unacceptable for truly scientific criticism, which is based not on the arbitrary dictates of subjective or group vision, but on an objective, ideological-artistic analysis of the texts and the establishment of their links with living realities, with the people's spiritual experience, and with the practice of communist construction. Let us not forget either that the party calls on critics to combine exactingness with tact and solicitousness toward talent.

Moreover, dynamic reality itself makes it necessary to review many stereotypes, many habitual forms of literary-ideological activity. Without creative imagination, without initiative and fighting qualities, criticism is inconceivable, since without them it simply will not fulfill its ideological-artistic tasks.

TASS REPORTS GAZLI EARTHQUAKE RELIEF MEASURES

LD211448 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1332 GMT 21 Mar 84

[Text] Gazli, 21 Mar (TASS) -- TASS special correspondents Abdumadzhit Fazylov and Svyatoslav Fetyunin report: Another natural disaster has struck the new town of Gazli in the Kyzylkums (central Asia), which suffered an earthquake in 1976, and in a short time arose again from ruins. Now, as we are transmitting this report, it is less than 24 hours since the force 9 earthquake [on the 12-point scale used in the USSR] again tried the strength of the town and the character of the people living and working there.

At 0129 local time the subterranean shock aroused the entire town. People came out into the street and many rushed to the hospital and began removing patients from the building, in which cracks had appeared.

The electricity supply to the terminals of the Bukhara-Urals and central-Asia-center gas pipelines, 9 km from Gazli, was cut off. The duty watch under Khamid Achilov did everything necessary to prevent an emergency from arising. The buildings of the compressor station, built with allowance for seismic conditions, withstood the powerful earth tremor.

It was 0400 in the morning. The telephones were silent. The powerful energy which had burst out of the earth put engineering communications out of action and cut off water and gas supplies. Houses, kindergartens, and schools all suffered. [Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 0500 GMT on 22 March reported that 51,000 of the 95,000 square methods of housing in the town of Gazli were affected by the quake.] Order and organization were observed everywhere in the town itself. Doctors rendered medical assistance to the suffering. There had to be some injuries, and over 100 people received bruises. Most of them were taken by bus to Bukhara, the oblast center.

At 0650, an emergency session of the Bukhara Obkom was held. It was reported that in addition to Gazli, the earthquake also caused damage to the housing in Bukhara, Kagan, and a number of regions. It was mainly old houses that did not withstand the onslaught of the elements.

The leaders of the republic and of the Uzbek party organization and representatives of ministries and departments arrived in the earthquake region. A Tashkent-Bukhara airlift was put into operation to deliver tents, essential goods and medical supplies. These were immediately transported by road to the disaster areas. The airlift is still in operation.

At 1200, specialists began to study the pipeline terminal buildings. In extreme conditions, the equipment had withstood the test and was in working order. It is now only a matter of repairing the power transmission lines. Wokr on this is in full swing. This was the conclusion of the specialists.

Today, the enterprises in the disaster areas have begun operating on their normal timetables. Life is returning to normal.

BOOK PUBLISHED ON WORK WITH PEOPLE'S LETTERS

PM222135 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Mar 84 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "On Work With Letters"]

[Text] An anthology has been published entitled "V.I. Lenin and the CPSU on Work With Working People's Letters." ("V.I. Lenin, KPSS o rabote s pismami trudyashchikhsya") It comprises two parts. The first contains extracts from the works of V.I. Lenin, his letters, pronouncements, instructions and enquiries relating to the work of the state apparatus with working people's letters. The second section contains the materials of party congresses and conferences and Central Committee plenums and party and government resolutions concerning work with working people's letters.

The book is published by the Political Literature Publishing House.

LENINGRAD UNVEILS PLAQUE HONORING KOSYGIN

LD202148 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1930 GMT 20 Mar 84

[Text] News from Leningrad. A memorial plaque with a bas-relief portrait of Aleksey Nikolayevich Kosygin was solemnly unveiled today on building No 16/21 on the avenue which bears his name. One of the new main roads of the Krasnogvardeyskiy Rayon of Leningrad has been named thus in accordance with the decision of the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers on the perpetuation of the memory of Aleksey Nikolayevich Kosygin, a prominent figure of the Communist Party and the Soviet state, twice Hero of Socialist Labor. Many years of the life and activity of Aleksey Nikolayevich Kosygin were linked with Leningrad. He was born here, graduated from the institute here and worked as chairman of the Leningrad Gorispolkom.

BRIEFS

TASHKENT KOMSOMOL SIGNS AGREEMENTS -- The Tashkent Komsomol Committee has signed a friendship and cooperation agreement for 1984 with committees of youth organizations from the DRA, the PDRY, Cuba, Laos, the MPR, and Nicaragua set up by students of these countries studying in Tashkent. The agreements have further consolidated the friendly relations between the Uzbek youths and their foreign counterparts. The agreements provide for the organization of meetings dedicated to the glorious [word indistinct] in the life of friendly countries, international friendship nights, [word indistinct] competitions with foreign students, and excursions to the cities of the republic. [Text] [Tashkent International Service in Uzbek 1700 GMT 19 Mar 84 GF]

ARKHANGELSK OBLAST TELEVISION -- A Moskva system television retransmitter has gone into operation in Lopshenga; residents can now receive color transmissions. [Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 19 Mar 84 LD]

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS

IMPROVEMENT IN ECONOMIC RESEARCH STRESSED

PM221459 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Mar 84 First Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Raising the Standard of Economic Research"]

[Text] The role played by social sciences in elaborating the scientific foundations of the CPSU's policy increases considerably at the stage of mature socialism. A thorough and comprehensive substantiation is required in order to select the most effective avenues in the country's economic and social development during the new 5-year plan period which, as Comrade K.U. Chernenko noted at the CPSU Central Committee February (1984) Extraordinary Plenum, must become "the start of profound qualitative changes in production, a 5-year plan for a decisive improvement in the matter of intensifying all sectors of our national economy."

Economic science is called upon to reveal the natural laws inherent in the society in which we live and work, to transform theoretical elaborations into practical recommendations, and exert a more active influence on economic practice. It has vast opportunities for this: it employs more than 109,000 scientific and scientific-pedagogical workers.

At the same time, as the recently adopted CPSU Central Committee resolution "On Enhancing the Role of the USSR Academy of Sciences Economic Institute in the Elaboration of Crucial Questions of the Economic Theory of Developed Socialism" notes, the content and efficacy of scientific research work in this sphere still fails to meet the demands set before economic science by the 26th CPSU Congress and the subsequent Central Committee plenums. The elaboration of questions concerning the efficiency of production under conditions of its predominantly intensive development and concerning the ways to accelerate scientific and technical progress and improve the planned management of the national economic complex is still being performed to an inadequate standard.

The paramount task of economic science is to step up the elaboration of topical issues of the political economy of socialism, and to deepen the analysis of qualitative changes in production forces and of the ways to improve socialist production relations in close connection with the social processes occurring in our society. Practical work requires the scientists to reveal more fully the economic laws of socialism and the ways to make better use of them, substantiate the forms for combining nationwide, collective, and personal interests, and elaborate the problems of distribution relations taking into account each working person's actual contribution. What is needed is more detailed research into the key questions of production efficiency, intensive-type expanded reproduction, fundamental improvement of labor productivity, theoretical problems of scientific and technical progress and the economics of science, accelerated introduction of fundamentally new equipment and technologies in the national economy, and ways and means to develop the creative activity of the masses. More detailed analysis of the natural laws of the development and strengthening of the world socialist community and of the latest specific features of state monopoly capitalism is needed.

The party most urgently raises the question of beginning the widespread improvement of planning and management of the economy and the further reorganization of the economic merchanism on the basis of the Leninist principle of democratic centralism. An important matter for economic scientists is to engage in elaborating the theoretical foundations for the comprehensive improvement of management and planning in accordance with the tasks set by 26th CPSU Congress and the subsequent plenums of its Central Committee.

New organizational structures of management must be more actively offered for practical work, the interdependent development of sectors and of the country's economic regions must be helped, and financially autonomous relationships must be consolidated.

Science must give greater attention to enhancing the role of economic levers and incentives in the development of production, improving price formation, providing better criteria for evaluating the results of economic activity, offering scientific back-up for the introduction of new forms and methods of economic management, and making efficient use of computers. It is well known that economic experiments are now being conducted in industry. The scientists are called upon to play an important role in generalizing their results. Comprehensive verification by experiment and accurate and effective scientific analysis must make it possible to move on from the exploratory stage to confident advancement and bold actions.

The practical implementation of the results of economic research depends on the attitude of planning and economic organs, associations, and enterprises toward the introduction of scientific recommendations. There must be more active research on the basis of specific orders from ministries and departments. This system must be extended also to the cooperation between sectoral and VUZ scientific establishments and economic organs both centrally and locally.

Enhancing the efficiency of economic science requires a radical improvement in the style and method of scientific work, imposition of order in the planning, organization, and coordination of research, and elimination of duplication, formalism, and trivial research topics. The quality of dissertations for the degrees of candidate or doctor of science must improve and their subject matter must be subordinated to the urgent problems of national economic development. Here much depends on the party organizations of scientific collectives. They must create the kind of conditions that will help the formulation, creative discussion, and solution of problems posed by life. This goal must be served by discussion and by galvanizing the work of scientific periodicals, and above all the journal VOPROSY EKONOMIKI.

Jointly with the leadership of institutes, the party organizations must improve their work on the selection, placement and education of cadres, prevent scientists from becoming totally bound up in their ouw "dissertational" or group interests, and help create an atmosphere of mutual exactingness, responsibility, implacability toward shortcomings and breaches of discipline. The role of methodological seminars and scientific councils must be enhanced everywhere.

Soviet economic scientists are called upon to do everything in order to arrive successfully at the goals toward which economic science has been oriented by the 26th CPSU Congress and the subsequent CPSU Central Committee plenums, and to make their contribution to resolving the tasks of the improvement of developed socialism.

BRIEFS

KAZAKH COAL MINING -- Extraction of coal has been stepped up in the Kazakh SSR. In 1985, the Kazakh SSR will produce 134 million tons of coal. This will increase Kazakh SSR's supply of coal to the other parts of the Soviet Union. [Summary] [Tashkent International Service in Uzbek 1700 GMT 14 Mar 84 GF]

UZBEK WORKERS -- The Department of Statistics in Uzbek SSR has disclosed that the number of workers and civil servants in Uzbekistan increased by 260,000 last year. Most of them are youths who have been employed in accordance with his skills and qualifications. [Summary] [Tashkent International Service in Uzbek 1700 GMT

TAJIK AGRICULTURE PROBLEMS, TASKS EXAMINED

LD221146 Dushanbe Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 14 Mar 84

[Text] A meeting of heads of ministries and departments of the agro-industrial complex of the republic, of research establishments, and of leading scientists and specialists in agriculture and water economy has been held in the Tajikistan Communist Party Central Committee. The meeting examined the urgent measures required to be taken for the fulfillment of the socialist pledges adopted for 1984 regarding the production and sale to the state of agricultural and livestock-breeding produce in light of the decisions of the 26th party congress, and the subsequent plenums of the CPSU Central Committee, the implementation of the tasks of the Food Program and the tasks stemming from the speech made by Comrade Chernenko, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at the February 1984 Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, and his speech addressed to the electors of the Kuybyshev constituency of Moscow.

The unfavorable conditions that arose in the late spring of the current year have created serious difficulties for carrying out spring agricultural work. The sowing of early cereal and fodder crops has practically not been started in the first 2 months, whereas by this time last year they were sown correspondingly over 54 and 28 percent of the allocated areas. Special emphasis was placed on the necessity to raise the level of organizational and mass political work with a view to considerably increasing the rate of completion of the whole complex of spring agricultural work and to get ready for sowing cotton.

In the first place, it is necessary to complete everywhere the washing of salty soils, the cleaning of the interfarm and intrafarm drain collection and irrigation networks, and to carry out watering, and planning of fields. This work is carried out especially slowly on the farms of Shaartuz, Kuybyshevskiy, Nauskiy, Parkhar and Gissar Rayons. The washing and watering is unjustifiably delayed on farms of Kurgan-Tyube Oblast. It was noted at the meeting that the deployment of mass sowing of all crops should become the subject of special concern in all places.

At the same time, there is a lot of unprepared machinery on the farms of Leninabad, Kulyab and Kurgan-Tyube Oblasts, and also in Gissar and a number of other rayons. Clear schedules for field work are not complied with everywhere. In some rayons the sowing machinery has not been fully manned with experienced machine operators. The grain and grass seeds have not been everywhere graded and cleaned properly in preparation for sowing, and the cotton seeds have not been fully prepared.

It was found necessary to conduct another detailed examination as quickly as possible of the readiness for mass sowing on every farm and at every field team. Specialists of the Ministry of Agriculture, and the Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources, [word indistinct] and the republic's committee from the production and supply of equipment for agriculture must exercise unabated control over all these matters.

Taking into account the delayed development of the winter cereal crops, special attention should be paid to early fertilization of crops and to carrying out immediate resowing in the fields where the crops are very sparse. The heads and specialists of farms must find additional reserves and fully utilize all possibilities for stepping up grain production in the current year.

It was noted that it is necessary to investigate everywhere as quickly as possible and organize [words indistinct] and their feeding and watering. The urgent task is to stop lagging behind with planting early vegetables and potatoes. The Ministry of Fruit and Vegetable Industry, councils of the oblast and rayon agro-industrial associations, and heads of [words indistinct] farms ought to take this work under unabating control.

It was pointed out at the meeting that many kolkhozes and sovkhozes insufficiently utilize the powerful factor of sharply increasing the quantity of natural fertilizers applied to the soil in raising the yields of agricultural crops. But the farms of Leninisky and Gissar Rayons applied less fertilizer this year than last. In (Kurgan-Tyube), Leninabad and Kulyab Oblasts, the task was set everywhere to step up the procurement and application of local fertilizers, as well as to raise considerably the effectiveness of utilization of mineral fertilizers.

The Tadjik agricultural chemicals authority's attention was drawn to instances of slackening of the organization of fertility detachments' work on kolkhozes and sovkhozes and toward the (?timely) feeding of winter cereal crops and grasses.

A great amount of work on raising productivity will have to be done in orchards and vineyards. It is important to fulfill the task of the current year in planting new orchards and vineyards in all the rayons and oblasts. The implementation of the scientifically justified crop rotation systems constitutes the basis of agriculture. However, only a little over 40 percent of these had been implemented by the beginning of this year. The implementation of crop rotation systems is especially unsatisfactory in the farms of Kanibadam, (Parkhar), and [name indistinct] 2 rayons.

The importance was stressed of the experiment being conducted, in the implementation of crop-rotation areas in the farms of Ilyichevskiy, Nauskiy, [name indistinct] and Tursunzade Rayons in combination with the full change-over to the collective work contract system was stressed.

The task was set to make the current year a turning-point in the implementation of the crop rotation system. It is necessary to compile concrete schedules for carrying out this work and to get them approved for every farm. The Ministry of Agriculture and the Ministry of Fruit and Vegetable Industry are instructed to assure strict control over the progress and fulfillment of this task.

The active work on perfecting the system of organization and remuneration of labor kolkhozes and sovkhozes, it was noted at the meeting, must promote the successful solution of the tasks facing the workers of the republican agro-industrial complex. In the first place, it means the introduction of the collective work contract system both in soil cultivation and stockbreeding. Special attention must be paid to the introduction of the collective work contract system in cotton growing. It is necessary to utilize in full the experience gained in this matter. The ministries, departments, and research establishments of the republic were instructed to engage themselves in more active and purposeful activity in the organization of this work.

The successful implementatic of the spring field work depends in a decisive degree on the organization and precise coordination of the activity of all enterprises and organizations of the agro-industrial complex, from the level of mass political and educational work in party committees, soviet, trade union and Komsomol organs.

The delivery to the fatherland of more cotton, grain, vegetables and potatos, grapes, fruit and other produce of fields and farms, and making a worthy contribution to the implementation of the Food Program is a matter of honor for each machine operator, team leader, specialist, head of a farm, scientist, and of every rural toiler.

Comrade Nabiyev, first secretary of the Tadjikistan Communist Party Central Committee, made a long speech at the meeting. Comrades Belov, Makhkamov, (Nasredinov) and Pallayev, members of the bureau of the Tadjikistan Communist Party Central Committee; and Comrade Maksumov, chairman of the Commission of the Presidium of the Tadjik SSR Council of Ministers for the agro-industrial complex, deputy Tadjik SSR, also attended.

PROTECTION OF INLAND FISH STOCKS DISCUSSED

PM221146 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Mar 84 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Protecting Nature"]

[Text] Volgograd, 16 Mar -- An all-union conference devoted to the tasks of improving coordination and collaboration between law-enforcement and nature protection organs in the struggle against violators of the laws protecting fish stocks in the country's inland waters concluded in Volgorad today.

The reports by A.M. Rekunkov, USSR prosecutor general, and V.M. Kamentsev, USSR minister of the food industry, as well as the speeches stressed that the struggle against water pollution has been intensified in recent years and that much has been done to protect and increase fish stocks. This has enabled a unique shoal of sturgeon to be reestablished in the lower reaches of the Volga, for example, and the commercial catch of them to be increased.

The conference participants devoted considerable attention to analyzing shortcomings and measures to overcome them. It was noted that the struggle against water pollution is still being carried out poorly. Enterprises of the USSR Ministry of Nonferrous Metallurgy, the USSR Ministry of Mineral Fertilizer Production, and certain other ministries and departments are causing especially heavy damage. Much remains to be done to prevent misappropriation at all stages of the catching and processing of fish. The need to intensify the struggle against poachers was stressed.

The conference participants -- workers in public prosecutor's offices and other law-enforcement organs, representatives of a number of ministries and departments, and academics -- adopted recommendations to intensify the struggle against violators of the laws on the protection of fish stocks in the country's inland waters.

IMPROVEMENT IN MILITARY ADMINISTRATION URGED

PM221420 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 20 Mar 84 Second Edition p 2

[Colonel V. Korniyenko report: "Administrative Questions at Focus of Attention"]

[Text] The considerable attention which the party is now devoting to problems of improving the style and methods of party and economic leadership at all levels is well known. This need was pointed out at the CPSU Central Committee February (1984) Plenum and in Comrade K.U. Chernenko's speech to voters. Naturally, these are also key problems in the activity of military administration organs. That is why they were the focus of attention of the meeting of chiefs of political sections of staffs and directorates of military districts and groups of forces and of directorate party committee secretaries.

The reports by Colonel General M. Popkov, member of the Military Council and chief of the Ground Forces Political Directorate; Colonel General D. Grinkevich, chief of the Ground Forces Main Staff, and other workers in the central apparatus, as well as the speeches, analyzed comprehensively the work of political organs and party committees in inculcating in staff officers a spirit of professionalism, assiduity, discipline, creative initiative, and responsibility for the state of affairs in their allocated area.

Summing up the meeting's results, Army General A. Mayorov, deputy commander in chief of the Ground Forces, stressed that improving the style and methods of administrative activity and ensuring that they strictly accord with the needs of the times are an indispensable condition for the further development of the combat readiness of units and subunits.